MARGINALITY AND ACCEPTANCE: EARLY BLACK SOCIOLOGISTS AND THEIR INCORPORATION INTO THE MAINSTREAM SOCIOLOGICAL COMMUNITY

By

SANDRA TAYLOR THOMPSON

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1991

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation has required the support, commitment, and encouragement of many people. I am deeply grateful to them all. My family, especially my husband, Tyree, and my children, Rahmaan and Lillian, endured much more than any family should ever be asked to. Other relatives such as Etta Mae Taylor (my mother), the late Audrey Morris, Bessie Forbes, and Catherine Brennan, stood by me to the fullest extent. Yvette Forbes, Renee Forbes, Herbert Taylor, and Dwight Taylor played various roles in enabling this work to unfold. My sister, Maria Davis, refused to let me give up. Her persistence paid off.

The faculty and staff of Florida Memorial College, especially Dr. Lee E. Monroe, President, Dr. Bennie Reeves, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Floydette Cory, Director of the Honors Program, Mrs. Norvik Myers, my secretary, and the members of the Division of Social Sciences--all played important roles in the completion of this dissertation.

I am deeply appreciative of the financial assistance provided by the American Sociological Association, the United Negro College Fund, and the Florida Endowment Fund.

I am truly grateful to my typist/proofreader, Mrs. Barbara Smerage, whose time and work have been invaluable. I am also grateful to the Sociology Department of the University of Florida, especially the members of my committee who believed in me and encouraged me all the way. The chairman of my dissertation committee, Dr. Leonard Beeghley II, was an outstanding chairman. His advice, support, and enduring confidence in me were invaluable. His encouragement and keen intellect gave me the guidance and direction I needed to complete this project.

Finally, I am grateful to God, the center of my life, for the inspiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

ABSTRACT vi

CHAPTERS

I THE MARGINAL MAN THESIS 1

Definition 1
How Do Marginal Men React 13

II RESEARCH STRATEGY 15

III WILLIAM EDWARD BURGHARDT DU BOIS 27

Biography 27
Basic Works 51
Reception 70
Conclusions 81

IV CHARLES SPURGEON JOHNSON 87

Biography 87
Basic Works 96
Reception 110
Conclusions 116

V EDWARD FRANKLIN FRAZIER 120

Biography 120
Basic Works 134
Reception 150
Conclusions 157

VI OLIVER CROMWELL COX 162

Biography 162
Basic Works 169
Reception 178
Conclusions 181

VII IMPLICATIONS OF THIS ANALYSIS................ 184

APPENDICES

A RACE RELATIONS TEXTBOOKS 198
B GENERAL SOCIOLOGY TEXTBOOKS.................. 204
C BLACK SOCIOLOGY TEXTBOOKS.................... 212
REFERENCES... 213
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.................................... 219

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

MARGINALITY AND ACCEPTANCE: EARLY BLACK SOCIOLOGISTS AND THEIR INCORPORATION INTO THE MAINSTREAM SOCIOLOGICAL COMMUNITY

By

Sandra Taylor Thompson

December 1991

Chairman: Leonard Beeghley, Ph.D.
Major Department: Sociology

This dissertation is an exploratory analysis of a sociological phenomenon that Georg Simmel identified as "social types." This concept can be defined as individuals with special characteristics who act in predictable ways as a result. The specific social type dealt with in this work is the "marginal man." A marginal man exists between two cultures, statuses, or social worlds. Whenever socio-cultural barriers are crossed, marginality exists. Marginality is explored by investigating the lives, works, and the reception given to four early black sociologists: W. E. B. Du Bois, Charles S. Johnson, E. Franklin Frazier, and Oliver Cromwell Cox.

The investigation begins with an analysis of the marginal man thesis. In an effort to examine the historical implications of this social type, the study points out the

stages, types, and nature of marginality. In this way, its conceptual usefulness becomes apparent.

The research strategy pursued in this dissertation includes a detailed examination of the biographies, basic works, and reception of the basic works of each of the four scholars mentioned earlier. The relevance of examining each of these items to an understanding of the marginal man thesis is explained.

The nature of race relations and American sociology at the turn of the century makes the investigation of black intellectuals generally, and black sociologists specifically, an especially plausible focus for the study of the marginal man thesis. While racism and marginality are not necessarily intertwined, the lines of segregation and discrimination at the turn of the century were so clearly drawn that they readily set the parameters for a study of this nature.

In the conclusion, the implications of this work for understanding race relations, marginality, and the roles of black Americans the field of sociology are explored.

CHAPTER I
THE MARGINAL MAN THESIS

Definition

This work is an exploratory analysis of a phenomenon which Georg Simmel identifies as "social types." Social types can be defined as individuals with special characteristics who act in predictable ways as a result. The particular social type explored is the marginal man. Robert E. Park identified this social type as the marginal man. Park, Everett Stonequist, and others contributed significantly to an understanding of this phenomenon. However, the basic theory and conceptualization of the marginal man appears to have begun with W. E. B. Du Bois.

In 1928, Robert E. Park wrote an essay entitled "Human Migration and the Marginal Man." This essay characterized the conflicts and problems faced by those individuals who are culturally or racially different from the dominant people among whom they live. Such cultural differences generally appear because of migration. Park argued that as a result of migration the individual may experience an "emancipation." "Energies that were formerly controlled by custom and tradition are released. The individual is free for new adventures, but he is more or less without direction and control" (1928b, p. 887).

Park recognized, however, that whole groups can also be composed of marginal people. For example, relations between different races may be predicated on slavery, as with American blacks or some other "conqueror-conquered" relationship, as with the caste system in India. In such cases, the processes of acculturation and assimilation and the accompanying amalgamation may be problematic.

Park explained that "the dominant and the subject peoples become, in time, integral parts of one society. Slavery and caste are merely forms of accommodation, in which the race problem finds a temporary solution." In the case of American blacks, even with the dissolution of slavery, assimilation was now inhibited by prejudice and continued oppression. Park contended that "all our so-called racial problems grow out of situations in which assimilation and amalgamation do not take place at all, or take place very slowly." It is not because of mental ability but because blacks, like the Japanese, bear in their features distinctive racial hallmarks. "A racial uniform . . . classifies him. He is condemned to remain among us an abstraction, a symbol." As a result, stellar African Americans, especially black intellectuals, became what Park described as "cultural hybrids." A cultural hybrid is

> [an individual] living and sharing intimately in the cultural life and traditions of two distinct

> peoples; never quite willing to break, even if he were permitted to do so, with his past and his traditions, and not quite accepted, because of racial prejudice, in the new society in which he now sought to find a place. He was a man on the margin of two cultures and two societies, which never completely interpenetrated and fused. (1928b, p.892)

It is especially this aspect of marginality that guides the current investigation of the marginal man thesis. We explore reactions of and consequences for cultural hybrids, these individuals who--full entry into the mainstream, despite education, culture, or achievement--are denied because of barriers of discrimination established along racial lines.

The practices of segregation, lynching, and other derivatives of white supremacy fostered physical restraints against black Americans as well as social and psychological restraints. Racism was very strong and blatant. Though it existed more covertly in the North, and more overtly in the South, its pervasiveness was undeniable.

Most of the ceremonial and social rituals, peculiar to the South, developed through racial bias. Park cited examples:

> A colored nurse may ride, without objection, in a pullman coach if she has a white baby in her arms. On the other hand, if a white nurse should appear in the same car with a colored baby, no one knows what would happen. There is no provision in the social ritual for the unprecedented.
>
> Southern people have difficulty in addressing a colored man as "Mr." even though he may have achieved an eminent position in the world. In that case it is possible to avoid the difficulty, as one

> man is reported to have done in the case of Booker Washington, by calling him "Professor." (1928a, p. 19)

Du Bois noted the contradictions of these customs against the also common American ideals and religious teachings:

> This country professes loudly and blatantly a religion of mercy, humanity and sacrifice; we profess to regard all men as brothers, and teach that we should turn the other cheek to evil; and that all human distinctions not based on individual character and desert are false and wrong. Yet, at the mere presence of a colored face, again and again our whole moral fabric falls, fails and collapses, in simple matters of human intercourse, in larger matters of social service and in the very pews of the church itself. (1928, p. 8)

There existed a strong belief that blacks could not be assimilated* into the mainstream. This was paired with the sentiment that blacks should accept and maintain a posture of subservience. It may be argued that in the wake of slavery, blacks and whites were ill-prepared for assimilation along racial lines. As a result, racism and ignorance would play key roles in inhibiting this process. Du Bois analyzed the situation in The Philadelphia Negro (1899):

> This feeling, widespread and deep-seated, is in America the vastest of the Negro problems; we have, to be sure, a threatening problem of ignorance but the ancestors of most Americans were far more ignorant than the freedman's sons; these ex-slaves are poor but not so poor as the Irish peasants used to be; crime is rampant but not more so, if as much as in Italy; but the difference is that the ancestors of the English and the Irish and the Italians were felt to be worth educating, helping

---

*At this time, assimilation was seen as the most desirable form of group accommodation. Cultural pluralism was not yet popularly considered.

> and guiding because they were men and brothers, while in America a census which gives a slight indication of the utter disappearance of the American Negro from the earth is greeted with ill-concealed delight.
>
> Other centuries looking back upon the culture of the nineteenth would have a right to suppose that if, in a land of free men, eight millions of human beings were found to be dying of disease, the nation would cry with one voice, "Heal them!" If they were staggering on in ignorance, it would cry, "Train them!" If they were harming themselves and others by crime, it would cry,"Guide them!" And such cries are heard and have been heard in the land; but it was not one voice and its volume has been ever broken by counter-cries and echoes, "Let them die!" "Train them like slaves!" "Let them stagger downward!" (p. 387)

Yet, in spite of social group subordination, many African Americans rose above the external environment and moved along the path of cultural assimilation. Robert E. Park saw the marginal man as the individual who, in the process of cultural assimilation, "finds himself on the margins of two cultures and not fully or permanently accommodated to either" (1928b, p. 887). He saw the typical marginal man as being one of "mixed blood, an Eurasian, mestizo, or mulatto, . . . predestined to occupy a position somewhere between the two cultures represented by his respective parents." The marginal man tended to occupy a "separate caste or class." Yet, Park emphasized the point that the marginal man was a cultural, rather than a biological, phenomenon.

Park went on to stress that in the broader sense the marginal man was a personality type, . . . likely to be smart, i.e., a superior though sometimes a superficial, intellectual type. Yet, those marginal individuals continued to live "in the isolation of an immigrant community and are likely to sink to a cultural level in the country of their adoption that is lower than the level of the national or racial stock in the country of their origin. The marginal man usually had forced upon him the role of a cosmopolitan and a stranger" (1928b, p. 892). "Inevitably he becomes, relatively to his cultural milieu, the individual with the wider horizon, the keener intelligence, the more detached and rational viewpoint. Park also stated that the marginal man is always relatively the more civilized human being" (1931, p. 376).

Marginal men know well the reality of their social group, as well as the ideas, beliefs, customs, and stereotypes of the dominant group. As a result, marginal men react in the following ways.

1. They display feelings of ambivalence or frustration. There may be strong desires to be a part of either or both contrasting groups, while full acceptance by neither side occurs.
2. They display a determination to correct the misconceptions of the dominant group concerning their social group.

3. They display assumptions of being or becoming leaders or pace setters of their social group, or the society in general.
4. They determine to learn and present factors contributing to intergroup discord. Specific social structures are scrutinized.
5. They display a sense of urgency, a need to either extol the virtues of their social group and promote the virtues of the dominant group or to personally crusade against the subjugation of their social group by the dominant group.

Everett V. Stonequist, in an article entitled "The Problem of Marginal Man" (1935), states that

> The process of seeing one's self reflected in the attitudes of others toward one is so habitual with the ordinary individual that he is unaware of it; it requires a Cooley to discover and describe the process. But with the marginal person, it is as if he were placed simultaneously between two looking glasses, each presenting a different image of himself. The clash in the images cannot help but make the individual somewhat conscious of the process--conscious of the two mirrors and conscious of the two clashing images. (p. 7)

It is a dilemma that cannot be readily ignored. The nature of this consciousness compelled many marginal men to investigate further.

Everett Stonequist (1935, pp. 10-11), in his description of the marginal man, spoke of the existence of a marginal man life cycle. Three stages were defined. First, there is a stage of preparation when the individual is introduced into the two cultures. At least partial assimilation into the cultures must occur or the individual would not later experience the conflict of loyalties between the two cultures. This stage is generally confined to childhood. The second stage has the character of a "crisis": the individual becomes aware of the cultural conflict which involves his own career. "The typical traits of the marginal man arise out of the crisis experience and in response to the situation. The individual's life-organization is seriously disturbed. Confusion, even shock, restlessness, disillusionment, and estrangement may result; a new self-consciousness develops to mirror the newly-realized situation" (p. 11).

The third stage consists of the more enduring responses of the individual to the situation. He may continue toward the dominant group and perhaps eventually succeed in becoming an accepted member. Another possibility lies in the other direction, throwing one's lot with the subordinate group, if it's accepting. Stonequist (1935) states,

> The marginal individual's dual contacts may give him an advantage, making him a leader. Resentment may spur him to fight the dominant group; he becomes a "revolutionary" or aggressive nationalist. If his attention is centered on raising his own group by some other method, he may appear in the role of conciliator, reformer, teacher, etc. Such roles contribute to organize and give direction to the previously disturbed or disorganized individual, even though they do not always create complete inner harmony. (pp. 10-11)

On the other hand, the chosen career offered choices as it relates to its marginal men individually. They could use, reject, ignore, or accept any or all of the options.

Blackwell (1974) in Black Sociologists Historical and Contemporary Perspectives reported the feelings of black sociologists and black sociology teachers attending meetings of the American Sociological Association in this era. He wrote that they

> felt the strains of social isolation and self-consciousness so strongly that they soon withdrew into informal friendship cliques. Due to an involuntary, ascribed lowered status, voluntarily segregated themselves at national meetings for a social life free from the "put on" or perceived false friendship. (p. 345)

The feeling of marginality includes feeling either ignored, hated, or engaged on an unequal or distance basis strictly because of race, national origin, or ethnicity. At an earlier period, while even fewer in number, the feeling was intensified.

Stonequist believed that whether marginal men withdrew to form a subgroup in the midst of a large, career-oriented group or became leaders of their own social group or culture, that attention should be given those marginal men "strongly influenced and attracted" by the dominant group.

Stonequist explains (1935),

> Some of the members of the subordinate or minority group are able to live their lives within their own cultures, or at least to live in them sufficiently, not to be greatly disturbed by the culture of the dominant group. Others, however, find themselves more strongly influenced and attracted by the

> dominant group. The personality development of such individuals is of interest and significance both to theoretical and practical students of human behavior. Living as they do, in between the two cultures, their personalities and careers are interwoven and linked with both systems. They thus mirror in their own personalities aspects of the two cultures, and especially the relations of the two cultures. (pp. 2-3)

It is, therefore, within the personalities and lives of those marginal persons that one may discover the impact and implications of marginality. The particular era, of focus, is around the turn of the century, capturing individuals Alain Locke referred to with his 1925 anthology, The New Negro. To Locke, this period, and the attainments of blacks educationally and culturally, was evidence of a "new phase of group development and with it came a spiritual Coming of Age" (Locke, 1925, p. 16). New status placed marginal men in clear focus.

Everett Cherrington Hughes, in a work entitled "Social Change and Status Protest: An Essay on the Marginal Man," describes this dimension to the dilemmas of the marginal man. According to Hughes, the "American Negro is a man with a status dilemma, and the more he, as an individual, acquires of those elements of American culture which bring to others the higher rewards of success, the greater is his dilemma." Hughes (1971) goes further:

> In addition, the American Negro is a living contradiction of the canons of status in the American culture. The contradiction lies in the fact that a member of a group assigned a very humble and limited status bears other characteristics which ordinarily give or allow

> the individual to acquire higher status. The contradiction is objective, in that it appears to the eyes of others. . . . The dilemma, on the other hand, is essentially subjective. (p. 221)

To emphasize this point of status and marginality, Hughes asks his readers to imagine two polar societies. In the first, statuses are well established. Determinants include descent, gender, social learning, and various accomplishments, arriving at a certain age, or such rites of passage as initiation or marriage. Persons of a given status would exhibit a whole complex of social attributes which seem naturally to pertain to that status. Status identification would be clear and unquestioned by each person or others. In the other society, there would be a complete free-for-all. Talents that are both virtuous and nefarious would have full play. Everyone would get exactly what they have coming to them by virtue of their own efforts. As Hughes says, "it is a society without a hang-over from its past" (1971, p. 222). He mentions that no such society exists in either category and that most are somewhere between both. Although the United States was closer to the free-for-all, during the early years of this century, it actively maintained vestiges of its past, a time of slavery, by legal and illegal means of oppression.

In this context, the status dilemma Hughes described characterized any successful black person. For example, Hughes sketched the status dilemma facing a black physician. When blacks became physicians, the question always arose as to whether to treat these persons as blacks or as physicians. They became individuals caught on the periphery of two contradictory statuses. "Status," he says, "refers specifically to a system of relations between people." But he goes on to explain that the definition of the status lies in the culture. "One of the essential features of a person's status may be his identification with a culture." The American racial dilemma is highlighted when occupational status clashes with racial status--then, marginality becomes evident. How then does one armed with the best elements of the predominant culture and, at the same time, the badge of the subjugated culture, deal with the contradiction: Being a "Negro Sociologist," especially at a time when sociology was so young in America and served more as a microcosm of the society, rather than as a microscope to the society? Concurrently, the term Negro, most commonly used to refer African Americans (during the early 20th century), seemed to have further conjured the image-alien, or misfit.

Du Bois, viewing this phenomenon as a black man, wrote in his book, The Souls of Black Folk (1903) a description of what he labeled "double consciousness":

> The Negro is a sort of seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second-sight in this American world--a world which yields him no true self-consciousness, but only lets him see himself through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels this two-ness--an American, a

> Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. (p. 16)

The marginal man could be a stranger--someone identifiable as an alien or outsider by his physical features, accent, or name. He could be the product of a biracial or bicultural union. Or he could be a native of any given land but dares to defy the normative standards prescribed for his racial/ethnic group and attempts moving directly into the mainstream. He is viewed with whatever spectacles are generally used to view his "kind." Unable to fit that mold, he finds himself in a marginal zone.

Since marginality is a social type, it is only applicable to certain people. All African Americans were not marginal men, only those who were distinct and unique to the normative status of their social group while being largely excluded or ignored by the mainstream. It is the reflection of a relative relationship. It may occur at birth, when an individual migrates, or when one reaches a certain level of social attainment. Even gender and certain occupations may assure marginality for some. The implication is that a nontraditional dichotomy is represented by an individual.

How Do Marginal Men React

Marginality can be handled in several different ways. A marginal man may reject the traditional culture assigned to him and seek to assimilate into the adopted or achieved culture. A second option for the marginal man is to accept his marginality and seek to increase the number of individuals in this arena, sometimes leading or organizing others of similar status. The third option is to reject the traditional group and the achieved group and seek the emergence of a new social/economic order which would make current divisions obsolete.

The issue of marginality poses two other considerations as well. First, how does the core culture of the marginal man respond to him? Is there acceptance or rejection? Second, how does the dominant group respond to the marginal man? Is there acceptance or rejection? It is likely that in both cases the marginal man is held in a special place apart from the mainstream of either group.

This work is an exploratory analysis designed to examine what happens to the marginal man. The concept of existing under a "glass ceiling" seems to readily apply to the marginal man. Though the ceiling is invisible, he quickly becomes aware of the fact that it exists. At the same time, because the ceiling is made of glass, he quickly gets the feeling of being in a fish bowl. Eventually, he begins to see himself through the eyes of those looking in. How does the marginal man react? The methods used to conduct this exploratory analysis will be addressed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER II
RESEARCH STRATEGY

The marginal man lives between two cultures. Their personalities and careers are interwoven and linked with both systems. This dissertation is an effort to examine that phenomenon. The research strategy includes an examination of the biographies, the basic works, and the reception to the basic works of four early African American sociologists: W. E. B. Du Bois, Charles S. Johnson, E. Franklin Frazier, and Oliver C. Cox. Each was born (with the exception of Du Bois) during a period when a host of progressive pioneering African American scholars, writers, and poets were born (1884-1912)--Charles S. Johnson (1893), E. Franklin Frazier (1894), and Oliver C. Cox (1901). Others outside the field of sociology include Jesse Fauset (1884), Jean Toomer (1894), and Ralph Bunche (1904), to mention a few.

Du Bois was born in 1868, about 16 years before the cadre of outstanding individuals who would comprise the "New Negro Movement" (of the 1920s). The New Negro Movement was the cornerstone of what came to be known as the Harlem Renaissance. This was a period of unparalleled achievements by blacks, especially in the arts. Blacks seem to view cultural and intellectual achievement as their special mission.

The prevailing theoretical assumption, at the time, however, was that blacks should eventually assimilate into mainstream America. This was tantamount to losing one's identity and becoming similar to the group that engulfed it. The question of marginality arises when one asks, what happens when, first, America is not ready for such assimilation (as demonstrated by the existence of overt and covert racism) and, second, when blacks are not committed to a loss of identity (as demonstrated by the nationalism of the Harlem Renaissance)? One may be considered a marginal man.

The biographies of each of the four black sociologists are examined in an effort to see what role their backgrounds played in how they responded to marginality. It is highly likely that the clues to whom they were, and the approaches they took, are included in those experiences which served to complement their choice of careers and the choices made in how to address racism on the one hand and nationalism on the other.

A review of the basic works will provide a look at their perspectives and viewpoints. In some cases, it is also possible to get a glimpse of real feelings. In other cases one can see the approach they took to their research, their topics, their analyses and findings. These, too, are revealing.

Another emphasis of this dissertation is the acceptance of these marginal men by the field of sociology. The nature of sociology, as a discipline of study, gives it a unique posture by which it can examine the dynamics of society, objectively and critically. How it accepted society's marginal men during its early stages, in America, is of crucial importance to this study.

In 1971, Howard M. Bahr, Theodore J. Johnson, and M. Roy Seitz published an article in The American Sociologist (1971, pp. 296-298) entitled, "Influential Scholars and Works in the Sociology of Race and Minority Relations, 1944-1968." Their work was a citation study which primarily sought to find out which scholars were the most frequently cited in articles on race and minority relations in 10 major sociological journals.

Using even numbered years only, and 10 leading sociological journals, the American Sociological Review, American Journal of Sociology, Social Forces, Social Problems, Sociology and Social Research, Trans-action, Phylon, Social Science Quarterly, Pacific Sociological Review, and Race, Bahr, Johnson, and Seitz examined 4,805 references. They discovered that overall, between 1944-1968, E. Franklin Frazier was the most frequently cited scholar of the era in those journals. Frazier was followed closely by Robert E. Park, Gunnar Myrdal, Emory I. Bogardus and W. Lloyd Warren. Charles S. Johnson ranked 7th and W. E. B.

Du Bois ranked 16th. Oliver C. Cox did not place among the top 28 most frequently cited researchers listed. However, in the articles' list of most works most frequently referenced in articles dealing with race and minority relations in the 10 journals surveyed between 1944-1968, Cox's _Caste, Class and Race_ ranked 13th. Two of E. Franklin Frazier's works also appear on that list. _The Negro in the United States_ (1949, 1957) ranked eighth, while _The Negro Family in the United States_ ranked ninth.

The present study presents a count of the total number of citations listed in the _International Index to Periodicals_, _Social Science Index_, and the _Social Science and Humanities Index_. All citations for Cox, Du Bois, Frazier, and Johnson were included. No journals or periodicals were eliminated. Results are indicated in Table 1.

According to citations listed in the _International Index to Periodicals_ from 1915 to 1968, Frazier was cited most frequently with 31 citations, followed by Johnson with 22 references, Du Bois with 21, and Cox with 9. Data from the _Social Science Citation Index_ and the _Social Science and Humanities Index_ from 1969 to 1987 indicate that Du Bois was most frequently cited with 1,194 references followed by Frazier with 722, Johnson with 256, and Cox with 185. Du Bois wrote fiction as well as nonfiction works.

Table 1

Total Number of References in Sociological Journals and Periodicals as Listed in The International Index to Periodicals, Social Science Index, and the Social Science Humanities Index

Author	International Index	Social Science Index & Social Humanities Index	Total
Cox, Oliver C.	9	185	194
Du Bois, W. E. B.	21	1,173	1,194
Frazier, E. Franklin	31	722	753
Johnson, Charles S.	22	256	278
TOTAL	83	2,336	2,419

Table 2 provides the results of a review of 112 Race and Race Relations textbooks (see Appendix A). Column 1 shows the total number of the 112 reviewed which cited each author at least once. Column 2 reflects what percentage of the total number in Column 1 is. Du Bois was cited in 61 percent of the total, followed by Frazier with 51 percent, Johnson 34 percent, while Cox was cited 31 percent of the total. Columns 3 through 5 are divided into three time periods with equal intervals of 20 years with the exception of the last interval which consists of 21 years and gives the actual number of citations appearing in the sources. It is not too surprising that none of the sources reviewed which were published between 1924 and 1944 cited Cox as reflected in Column 3, mainly because Cox' earliest articles appeared in 1940, and his first book, Caste, Class and Race, did not appear until 1948. Du Bois was cited most frequently between 1924 and 1944, followed by Johnson with 70 citations and Frazier with 32. Even though Frazier had published articles as early as 1922, his earliest book, which was a late publication of his doctoral dissertation, did not appear until 1932; it was The Negro Family in Chicago. In 1932, Frazier also published The Free Negro Family. Johnson's first book, The Negro in Chicago: A Study of Race Relations and a Race Riot, appeared in 1922.

Du Bois continues to dominate between 1945-1965 with 101 citations. Du Bois' first book, The Philadelphia Negro,

Table 2

References to Oliver C. Cox, W. E. B. Du Bois, E. Franklin Frazier, and Charles S. Johnson in Race Relations Textbooks, 1924-1986

	Total Number of Works Citing Authors at Least Once		Number of Citations in Race Relations Textbooks			
Author	#	%	1924-1944	1945-1965	1966-1986	TOTALS
Cox, Oliver C.	35	31%		22	53	75
Du Bois, W. E. B.	68	61%	98	101	186	386
Frazier, E. Franklin	57	51%	32	53	276	361
Johnson, Charles	38	34%	70	71	77	218

appeared in 1898. Johnson maintained his second place status between 1945 and 1965 with 71 citations in the 112 sources during this period. Frazier maintained third place, but with a substantial increase from the earlier period with 53 references, and Cox with 22. However, between 1966 and 1986, Frazier surged dramatically ahead of the others with 276 citations to Du Bois' 186, Johnson's 77, and Cox's 53. Frazier's view that the black middle class was superficial and comprised of conspicuous consumers, who imitated the white American upper class but lacked its values, catapulted this marginal man into the forefront as the most quoted black sociologist between 1966 and 1986. Column G, however, indicated that combining all of the periods, Du Bois remains ahead with 386 citations, but Frazier is close behind with 361, Johnson's next with 218 and Cox' fourth with 75. This was not a scientific sampling (see Appendix B). Table 3 reflects general sociology textbooks reviewed. Table 3 also supports the earlier findings.

Though sociologists writing general sociology textbooks have greater leeway in whom they cite, it is clear that sociologists, as opposed to political analysts or commentators, wrote or edited these sources. One hundred forty-four Introductory Sociology textbooks were reviewed: Columns 1 and 2 reflect that Frazier was cited at least once, more frequently than any of the others, being cited in 35%

Table 3

References in General Introductory Sociology Textbooks, 1924-1987

Author	Total Number of Works Citing Author One or More Times		Total Number of References in General Introductory Sociology Textbooks			
	#	%	1924-1944	1945-1965	1966-1986	TOTAL
Cox, Oliver C.	25	17%	2	28	9	39
Du Bois, W. E. B.	26	18%	13	30	14	54
Frazier, E. Franklin	51	35%	12	101	40	153
Johnson, Charles S.	39	27%	30	61	12	103

percent of the introductory sociology textbooks. Johnson follows with citations in 27 percent of the textbooks, Du Bois with 18 percent, and Cox with 17 percent. Column 3 indicates, however, that within the textbooks citing each scholar at least once during the period 1924 to 1944, Johnson was cited most frequently with 30 references, Du Bois has 13, Frazier 12, while Cox is referred to only twice in the sample during the period. Between 1945 and 1965 Frazier is cited most frequently with 101 citations followed by Johnson with 61, Du Bois with 30 and Cox with 28. Between 1966 and 1986, Frazier was cited most frequently with 40 references, followed by Du Bois with 14, Johnson with 12, and Cox with 9. Column 6 indicates the total number of citations from 1924 to 1986: Frazier leads with 153, Johnson has 103, Du Bois 54, and Cox 39.

Only three textbooks on black sociology (see Appendix C) were located, and the results of that survey are indicated in Table 4.

In the book indicated by Column 1, Frazier was referenced most frequently, followed by Du Bois, Johnson and Cox. This source included two chapters on Du Bois, one chapter on Frazier, and one chapter on Johnson. There were no chapters on Cox, even though a section of one chapter focused on him. In book two, Du Bois was referenced most frequently, followed by Frazier and Cox. Johnson was not cited at all. In book three Frazier was cited most

Table 4

References in Black Sociology Textbooks to Oliver C. Cox, W. E. B. Du Bois, E. Franklin Frazier, and Charles S. Johnson

Author	Book		
	1	2	3
Oliver C. Cox	15	2	0
W. E. B. Du Bois	47	11	6
E. Franklin Frazier	54	7	8
Charles S. Johnson	46	0	0

frequently, followed by Du Bois. Neither Cox nor Johnson were mentioned. A fourth black sociology work, an anthology with no references (Ladner, Appendix C), was also reviewed. All four of the sociologists studied are mentioned in this work. However, being that it is an anthology, articles are included from several sociologists. Of the four studied in this work, an article by only one is included. It is an article by Frazier.

Joseph Gittler in a book entitled Review of Sociology Analysis of a Decade (1957) noted that the "two early books" most commonly used as textbooks in American sociology classes on race relations [during the 1950s] were Charles S. Johnson's The Negro in American Civilization (1930) and Race Relations (1934) by Charles S. Johnson and W. D. Weatherford (Gittler, 1957, p. 334). Perhaps the implication of the citation study and Gittler's observation serve to highlight the marginality of the authors being cited. A need for marginal men to articulate the issues of race from a well-educated, scholarly stance did occur.

In summary, the research strategy included a review of indexes and current literature, and index references were reviewed for citation frequencies. Additionally, their biographies, basic, works, and the receptions of their basic works are explored throughout the remaining chapters.

CHAPTER III
WILLIAM EDWARD BURGHARDT DU BOIS

Biography

William Edward Burghardt Du Bois was born in Great Barrington, Massachusetts, on February 23, 1868. His father was a descendant of black and French Huguenot ancestry. His mother was a descendant of Dutch-African ancestry. Du Bois, in summing up his varied racial background, said he was born "with a flood of Negro blood, a strain of French, a bit of Dutch, but thank God! . . . no 'Anglo-Saxon'" (1920, p. 9).

Du Bois' father deserted him and his mother while he was rather young. Initially, his mother moved back to her father's farm, but by the time Du Bois reached school age, she moved to the town in order to allow her son the best educational opportunities she could. She died in 1885 shortly before he was to leave for college. But she had already instilled in him a strong pride in his family (which had been free since the American Revolution) and her own ambitious desire for his success.

Growing up in Great Barrington, Du Bois recalled in his autobiography he had almost no experiences of segregation or color discrimination. But he did have a race consciousness, even there. It was not until he went to Fisk University in

Nashville, Tennessee, in the fall of 1885 that he "suddenly came to a region where the world was split into black and white halves, and where the darker half was held down by race prejudice and legal bonds, as well as by deep ignorance and dark poverty" (1968, p. 36).

It was also at Fisk where Du Bois moved away from organized religion. In Great Barrington, he had been trained in a Congregational Sunday school and had received funds from churches (as well as other scholarships) to attend college. His first year at Fisk he joined the Fisk congregation. But, during his three years at Fisk, he lost faith in the Church. In his autobiography he attributed his change of heart to the heresy trials, especially the suspension of Charles H. Briggs from the Presbyterian Church over his "higher criticism" of the Bible, the insistence of the local church that dancing was a sin, and the compulsory "Book of Christian Evidences," which was to him a "cheap piece of special pleading."

It was here, in the South, where Du Bois became clearly aware of his emerging marginal status. He arrived expecting a sense of cultural nationalism and a cadre of budding intellectuals eager to advance educationally to serve as leaders of their race. This is not what he found. Accommodationists and apologists were the norms. He did not relate to the other students or the South in the ways he expected. Yet, he related very well with his instructors.

At the time, all of the professors at Fisk were white, except one. He graduated from Fisk in 1888 with an A.B. degree.

He entered Harvard College in 1888 as a junior and graduated cum laude in 1890 with yet another A.B. degree. Du Bois earned his M.A. degree from Harvard in 1891. From 1892 to 1894 he studied and traveled in Europe. He matriculated at the University of Berlin for more concentrated study in the social sciences. Du Bois studied economics, history, and sociology under such men as Adolf Wagner, Heinrich von Treitschke, Max Weber, and Gustav von Schmoller. It is probable that Schmoller, more than any other professor under whom he studied, stressed the value of a hard-nosed empiricism and the faith that a systematic body of knowledge could be used to shape national policy (Broderick, 1958, p. 16). In 1895, he became the first African American to receive the Ph.D. degree from Harvard. Du Bois' Ph.D. degree was in history because Harvard did not have a separate program in sociology at that time (Du Bois, 1940, p. 39). Since he took many courses in the social sciences, he later noted that his program would have been considered sociology if Harvard had offered the degree then. In describing his years at Harvard, Du Bois noted that the undergraduate years were relatively cordial and engaging. By the time he entered graduate school this attitude towards him had changed. He felt very isolated and alone, but he did not mind being considered a studious loner.

In class, he noted, Southerners refused to sit next to him, while Northerners ignored him outside the class. His professors, however, were quite different. They invited him to "smokers," to their homes, and to a variety of activities that he was unable to participate in otherwise. Du Bois never felt himself to be a part of Harvard. One other African American matriculating at Harvard at the same time as he was William Monroe Trotter (later the founder of the Boston Guardian). Du Bois wrote of the fact that Trotter had many white friends while at Harvard and that (even though Trotter was a few years behind him) he desired to be friends with Trotter as well, but Trotter paid very little attention to him (Du Bois, 1902, p. 120). Du Bois did not write of any serious attempts on his part to become friends with Trotter.

After receiving his doctorate, Du Bois applied for teaching positions at the three most prestigious black institutions: Howard, Hampton, and Fisk. There were no openings at any of these institutions, so he accepted an offer to teach the classics at Wilberforce College in Ohio. Du Bois would remain there from 1894-1896. But it was virtually an impossible working environment for him from the beginning. At that time, Wilberforce was a poor school run by the African Methodist Episcopal Church. Du Bois saw himself as a German-trained intellect with his cane and gloves. He became the personification of a marginal man. He was particularly disturbed at Wilberforce by what he felt was the inactivity of the church toward social reform and also by the emotionalism and fervor exhibited at the chapel. Expressionistic religion, a common trait of early black culture, bothered this marginal man immensely. It disturbed him also because classes were often interrupted for devotions and fastings (McGinnis, 1941, 164).

In 1896 he was employed by the University of Pennsylvania to conduct a research project in Philadelphia's Seventh Ward slums. The actual study was entitled *The Philadelphia Negro* (published in 1898). Du Bois envisioned *The Philadelphia Negro* as the beginning of a larger research program in which blacks across the United States (in both urban and rural communities) would be analyzed. Hence, in 1897 he gathered material for a study eventually published by the United States Bureau of Labor, entitled *The Negroes of Farmville, Virginia*. On the basis of these two works, Du Bois addressed the American Academy of Political and Social Science in the Fall of 1897, seeking support for an extensive program of research among blacks. He proposed a very ambitious research plan that would take decades to complete. It involved the endowment of a black college, which would serve as the center of this sociological research, while working closely and cooperatively with Harvard, Columbia, Johns Hopkins, and the University of Pennsylvania. As a marginal man, Du Bois saw this as a means by which bridges could be built across the margins. Not only would black and white institutions work closely together on an important project, but they would also generate a wealth of accurate information on blacks in America, thereby eradicating the ignorance and irrational beliefs used in the oppression of blacks.

At the same time, the world would become aware of a cadre of black intellectuals engaged in important social research at black institutions. Existing between two worlds, Du Bois sought to bring them together through a common research agenda. Unfortunately, the American Academy of Political and Social Science was not interested in this project. As a result, Du Bois would very soon attempt to implement the project himself.

In a paper which he wrote in 1897, Du Bois first asked the question, "What, after all, am I? Am I an American or am I a Negro?"--a question of a marginal man feeling as if he is of two worlds but not feeling as if he fully belonged to either. He continued

> One feels his two-ness an American, a Negro, two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings, two warring ideals in one dark body. . . .
>
> The history of the American Negro is the history of this strife--this longing to attain self-conscious manhood, to merge his double self into a better and truer self. . . .
>
> He would not Africanize America for America has too much to teach the world and Africa. He would not bleach the Negro soul in a flood of white Americanism, for he knows that the Negro blood has a message for the world. He simply wishes to make it possible for a man to be both a Negro and an American without being cursed and spit upon. . . . (1897, Shomburg Collection)

It is evident that in 1897 Du Bois felt particularly compelled to describe his feelings as a marginal man, even before the term was invented. For it was also, in 1897, while Du Bois was at a crossroad in his career, that he described himself as integrally a part of European civilization:

> Yet, more significant, one of its rejected parts; one who expressed in life and action and made vocal to many, a single whirlpool of social entanglement and inner psychological paradox. (1897, p. 194)

As a well-educated black American man, Du Bois saw it as his duty to make the world aware of the inner as well as the outer struggles of enlightened African Americans. He also saw it as his responsibility to be a leader. Based on his educational background, he saw it as his duty to begin the research that would combat the ignorance that so greatly divided the races.

So, in 1897, Du Bois accepted a teaching position at Atlanta University. The president of Atlanta University, Horace Bumstead, had already begun a modest research program which was turned over to Du Bois. Du Bois was also expected to supervise the sociology program there. Efforts had been made (by whites) to discourage Bumstead from hiring Du Bois because of Du Bois' lack of acceptable religious beliefs. Du Bois agreed to a compromise; he would use the Episcopal prayer book when performing his student chapel duties (Rudwick 1969, p. 39). Bumstead, a white New Englander who strongly believed that blacks would make great strides through their "exceptional men," hired him.

Du Bois envisioned a most comprehensive research study of black Americans which would take several decades of continuous work. He proposed a 100-year plan. Du Bois (1940) explained,

> The method employed is to divide the various aspects of his [the black American's] social conditions into ten great subjects. To treat one of these subjects each year as carefully and exhaustively as means will allow until the cycle is completed. To begin then again on the same cycle for a second ten years. So that in the course of a century, if the work is well done, we shall have a continuous record on the condition and development of a group of 10 to 20 millions of men--a body of sociological material unsurpassed in human annals. (p. 88)

Du Bois believed that this was a rare opportunity to freely study every aspect of black life, thereby eliminating the cloud of ignorance and misconceptions held by so many about blacks:

> . . . so rare an opportunity to observe and measure and study the evolution of a great branch of the human race as is given to Americans in the study of the American Negro. Here is a crucial test on a scale that is astounding and under circumstances peculiarly fortunate. By reason of color and color prejudice the group is isolated--by reason of incentive to change, the changes are rapid and kaleidoscopic; by reason of the peculiar environment, the action and reaction of social forces are seen and can be measured with more than usual ease. We urge and invite all men of science into the field, but we plead for men of science--not for . . . men with theories to sustain or prejudices to strengthen. We sincerely regret that there has been a tendency for so many men without adequate scientific knowledge and without conscientious study to pronounce public opinions and put gratuitous slurs on me and my people which

> were as insulting to us as they were to their own scientific reputations. (pp. 86, 89)

Atlanta University was a poor, struggling institution that could not undertake the cost for such an ambitious research on the scale that Du Bois had hoped for. Even though the research would cost less than $500 a year, it was often difficult, and sometimes impossible, to secure even that small sum. Du Bois (1903) explained his difficulty and his plan:

> Work in sociology was inaugurated with the thought that a university is primarily a seat of learning and that Atlanta University, being in the midst of the Negro problems, ought to become a center of such a systematic and thorough going study of those problems . . . . We lack proper appliances for statistical work and proper clerical aid; notwithstanding this, something has been done. The plan of work is this: a subject is chosen; it is always a definite, limited subject covering some phase of the general Negro problem; schedules are then prepared, and these with letters are sent to the voluntary correspondents, mostly graduates of this and other Negro institutions of higher training. They, by means of local inquiry, fill out and return the schedules; then other sources of information, depending on the question under discussion, are tried, until after six or eight months' work a body of material is gathered. (p. 162)

Somehow, Du Bois, in spite of a rather busy teaching and research schedule, managed to supervise the preparation of 16 Atlanta University sociological monographs between 1897 and 1914. These 16 monographs are uneven in methodology, quality, planning, and content, but the Atlanta monographs proved an excellent base for future scholars to develop, test, and publicize their various themes. At the end of each year's project, Du Bois (and Atlanta University) hosted a conference that brought educated blacks and a sprinkling of sympathetic whites to the campus for a discussion of the relevance of the research topic to the future advancement of blacks. Du Bois (1908) served on the resolutions committee of these gatherings, the results of which were printed in the annual monographs. Unfortunately, though the resolutions were greatly influenced by Du Bois, they did not grow out of the inductive studies and generally failed to suggest specific techniques to accomplish the desired goals. Even though the Atlanta monographs were uneven and plagued with limitations, they were indeed important:

> When we at Atlanta University say that we are the only institution in the United States that is making any serious study of the race problems . . . we make no great boast because it is not that we are doing so much, but rather that the rest of the nation is doing nothing. (pp. 835-836)

The Atlanta monographs stressed a theme of "Negro achievement." Even before World War I, Du Bois focused on "Negro Civil Rights." Earlier he had endorsed Booker T. Washington's emphasis on an economic base for black progress at the expense of political activity and social acceptance--as a stopgap measure. When the stopgap became a dead end, and disfranchisement spread like a plague, legal discrimination increased, and lynching became endemic, Du Bois' views changed and he withdrew his support of Washington's philosophy.

The lynching of Sam Hose, a Georgia black man who allegedly killed his white landlord's wife, was the event which helped to change Du Bois' mind. As an Atlanta University professor, he had hoped to publish a discussion of the case in the Atlanta Constitution. Before he arrived at the newspaper office, Hose was already lynched, and his knuckles were on display at a nearby grocery store. This atrocity associated with Hose's death symbolized to Du Bois the Southerners' refusal to consider the black race human enough to be accorded even elemental justice (1901, p. 140).

In The Souls of Black Folk (1903) Du Bois held Booker T. Washington accountable for the acceleration of black deprivations. Because Du Bois changed his mind about what strategy was best, he perhaps believed Washington should have, too. A rift developed between Washington and Du Bois that became irreparable. Booker T. Washington was a very proud and authoritarian figure. He projected the idea that blacks should become self-sufficient by providing services and trades to whites; he was adored by wealthy Southern whites. Du Bois also believed in black self-sufficiency; however, he had difficulty accepting the idea that industrial work, working with one's hands, or being the servant class was the solution to problems encountered by blacks. Washington was very powerful. Whenever a black was being considered for a governmental, academic, or journalistic position, Washington was often contacted. He was able to make or break the careers of many black Americans with a simple "yes" or "no." In the case of Du Bois, Washington decided to use a threefold approach. First, he commanded newspapers (with allegiances to him) to ignore Du Bois, not reporting his activities or writings. Second, he used personal influence to cause individuals not to align with Du Bois or other "radicals." Third, he used his influence with philanthropists not to extend support to radical educators, such as Du Bois.

Du Bois not only experienced Washington's wrath but also his vindictiveness as well. Booker T. Washington, who had connections in Washington, D.C., and who had the ear of federal officials, exercised his power to close all federal funding for Du Bois' projects at Atlanta University. Washington was clearly the most influential black person of his day. Washington believed strongly that blacks should accommodate segregation. At the same time, he apologized for the Southern white racists by assuring the country that such activities, such as lynching, were isolated incidences and only the extremists' depiction of the South. Du Bois believed in black nationalism but despised discrimination, and he believed in the importance of the development of a liberally educated cadre of black intellectuals to serve as leaders of the race.

Du Bois developed a theory of the "Talented Tenth" (1903), which proposed that at least one-tenth of the black race should be educated not just to use their hands but to use their minds. He thought that at least one-tenth of the black community should emerge as leaders if given a chance to be nurtured and encouraged. It was a perspective that he would later abandon in favor of the idea that given the opportunities and education, many more AFrican Americans could demonstrate proficiency and excellence in a vast array of areas.

In 1905, he began organizing the Niagara Movement. This organization, which initially consisted of 29 participants, came together at Fort Erie, Ontario, to denounce lynching, discrimination, and racism. They sought to demand freedom of speech and criticism, voting rights for blacks, the abolition of all caste distinctions based simply on race and color, assert a belief in the dignity of labor, and to organize constant protest for black rights. This group consisted of individuals of those Du Bois termed the "Talented Tenth."

By 1907, Du Bois had been influenced by American socialism and spoke out against the exploitation of the common blacks and stressed "cooperation in capital and labor, wider distribution of capital and a more general equality of wealth and comfort." Even though he did not condone most of what the American socialists were about, he was attracted by their ideals of "human brotherhood, equality of opportunity, and work not for wealth but for Weal." Still, he maintained his belief that discrimination could be eradicated without overthrowing capitalism. At the same time, however, he began speaking more about the race becoming transformed into a "self-supplying group," and he encouraged the development of a network of profit-sharing associations.

Du Bois became painfully aware of the raging, sometimes flaring, "anti-African American" forces in America. As a result, he began to question his effectiveness as a sociologist at Atlanta University. Perhaps because of the constant shortage of funds, the controversy he brought (as a result of his conflict with Booker T. Washington), the uneven quality of the sociological monographs produced under his leadership, or the waning support for the conferences which were held annually to discuss the findings of the case studies, Du Bois began looking for other means by which he could express his ideas and concerns for his race.

At this particular point in his life, his marginality was quite evident. He found himself on the periphery of his profession. He never expected Atlanta University to shoulder the entire weight of his long-term study. He expected and invited larger white institutions to join in. This never happened. The social reforms he expected his research to foster were unrealistic. The studies, relying mainly on volunteers to conduct the surveys, left much to be desired. At the same time, they were pretty much ignored by those in political circles. Du Bois then concluded that social research was futile (1920, pp. 21-22), thereby relegating himself further into marginality and further away from his profession.

He could not agree with Booker T. Washington and his followers' view of the black race as mainly a servant class to whites. He could not agree with the popular white racist view that all blacks were inferior to all whites. At the same time, he did not totally agree with the main radical of the era, William Monroe Trotter. Trotter had matriculated at Harvard while Du Bois was in graduate school there, had worked with Du Bois in the Niagara Movement, was the founder and editor of the Boston Guardian, and a staunch opponent of Booker T. Washington. It was also Trotter who first heralded the voice of Du Bois as a viable alternative to Washington's. But, Trotter and Du Bois had a series of disagreements; perhaps both haughty personalities prohibited real friendship from developing. Also, Du Bois began moving more and more towards separatists' views while Trotter became more and more a radical integrationist.

Increasingly, he turned his attention to writing propaganda that aggressively and unconditionally demanded the same civil rights for blacks that other Americans enjoyed--something he did not stress in the Atlanta monographs. In 1909 he became a founder of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. In 1910 he left Atlanta University to work for the new organization. For a brief period he continued the Atlanta studies, but his basic interest now lay elsewhere.

Although Du Bois had left the field of sociology, the changes in his views would continue to reflect a man with a keen insight and understanding of blacks, whites, and race relations: yet a man forever on the periphery--sometimes too far ahead of everyone else, other times, too far afield.

A stinging and malicious portrayal of Du Bois appeared in the *Atlanta Independent* (1910) and was reprinted in the *Washingtonians*. Even though the article was extremely biased, it captured elements of truth in describing Du Bois as an educated "stranger" among the black race who refused to participate in its social life. According to this article, he could not bring himself to converse with Atlanta blacks whom he encountered at the local barber shop (*New York Age*, Dec. 8, 1910). At the same time he did not give white Atlanta much opportunity to accept or discriminate against him. He did not ride the streetcars or attend the theaters (Embree, 1944).

From 1910 to 1934 Du Bois would serve as the editor of the NAACP's publication, *Crisis*. Du Bois persuaded the NAACP to support the Pan Africanism Movement. Even though he gave the movement life, Pan Africanism did not originate with Du Bois. He did, however, organize the Pan-African Congress of 1919 and continued to do so throughout the 1920's.

Du Bois had spoken of Africa as the "greater fatherland" of African Americans as early as 1895. Interest in what was termed "Pan-Negroism" or the establishment of links between African Americans and Africa was often present among black intellectuals. However, the Pan African Movement actually started moving forward in 1900, when H. Sylvester Williams, a West Indian lawyer practicing in London, called for blacks of distinction to come together and determine what they could do to address issues of colonialism and racism against blacks in Africa and around the world.

In spite of that London Pan-African conference in July 1900 and other conferences in the early 1900s, Du Bois labeled the colloquy he called in Paris, 1919, the First Pan-African Congress. The general tone of the Congress was apologetic and conciliatory, but resolutions were adopted proclaiming that blacks were physically, socially, and politically equal to all races. The natives of Africa, they asserted, should be given "local self-government." The Second Pan-African Congress met in 1921 in London, August 28-29, Brussels, August 31-September 2, and Paris, September 5-6. Du Bois was very concerned that his conference not be confused with Marcus Garvey's Back to Africa. So, even though he invited organizations as well as black governments, interested in people of African descent, Garvey and his Universal Negro Improvement Association (U.N.I.A.) were not invited. Du Bois later asserted in The Crisis:

> This is not a separatist movement. There is no need to think that those who advocate the opening up of Africa for Africans . . . desire to deport any large number of colored Americans to a foreign and, in some respects, inhospitable land. Once and for all, let us realize that we are Americans. . . .
>
> The African movement means to us what the Zionist movement must mean to the Jews, the centralization of race effort and the recognition of a racial fount. To help beat the burden of Africa does not mean any lessening of effort in our own problem at home. Rather it means increased interest. For any ebullition of action and feeling that results in an amelioration of the lot of Africa tends to ameliorate the condition of colored peoples throughout the world. And no man liveth to himself.

Du Bois organized a third conference in Lisbon and London in 1925 and a fourth token gathering held in New York in 1927. He did try to call another conference in 1929 in Tunis, but this did not occur because of growing apathy among his American cohorts and increasing indifference among his associates abroad.

In 1919, The Crisis was selling 104,000 copies a month and Du Bois had a free reign in the NAACP, even though he often had conflicts with members of the board. The NAACP stood for integration or incorporation, Du Bois for nationalism or self-imposed segregation. The difference occurred because, even though the NAACP's program was to serve as "organized opposition to action and attitude of the dominant white group," it involved "ceaseless agitation and insistent demand for equality: the equal right to work, civic and political equality, and social equality. It involves the use of force of every sort: moral suasion, propaganda and wherever possible even physical resistance." With the onset of the depression, Du Bois became convinced that

> There are, however, manifest difficulties about such a program. First of all it is not a program that envisages any direct action of Negroes themselves for the uplift of their socially depressed masses; in the very conception of the program, such work is to be attended to by the nation and Negroes are to be the subjects of uplift forces and agencies to the extent of their numbers and need. Another difficulty is that the effective organization of this plan of protest and agitation involves a large degree of inner union and agreement among Negroes.

The solution to this flaw in the NAACP's program (in Du Bois' view) was an "economic cooperative commonwealth" which would offset the exploitative consequences of class development under free enterprise. To unite around a program of this nature, Du Bois felt that blacks would need to adopt a policy of "voluntary self-segregation." The leadership of the NAACP would not even consider such a policy.

In 1926 a group of Communists made it possible for Du Bois to visit Russia, which he did in 1927. But, before he would accept money for this supposedly fact-finding trip, he had the Communists sign a statement acknowledging that he was under no obligations to them. When he returned, he excitedly reported,

> I stand in astonishment and wonder at the revelation of Russia that has come to me. I may be particularly deceived and half-informed. But, if what I have seen with my eyes and heard with my ears in Russia is Bolshevism, I am a Bolshevik. (Dusk of Dawn, 1940, pp. 286-288)

Du Bois, with his socialist sympathies, international enthusiasm, support of voluntary segregation, and belief in an economic cooperative commonwealth for African Americans, became more and more a complete marginal man, comfortably fitting in on neither side. But to the NAACP he was irreplaceable; the board knew it and, for now, submitted.

The depression of 1929, however, changed the rules. The Crisis was now deprived of its financial independence. The NAACP determined that it could no longer afford to support the editor's insistence on Negro separatism while the NAACP strongly endorsed integration. In 1934, Du Bois resigned.

After Du Bois resignation from the NAACP, his writings continually reflected this ideological premise of self-segregation and socialism. In Current History, he wrote a call for "a Negro Nation Within the Nation." At the same time, he called blacks who ignored his economic plans "idiotic" for waiting for "the salvation of a white god" (1935, pp. 265-270).

Du Bois returned to Atlanta University's Department of Sociology, and in 1939, he founded Phylon, a "Review of Race and Culture." His general objective was to find "a general view of human beings," but his specific goal was to revive his research on American blacks. Returning to the social sciences, while at Atlanta University, he wrote two major books, Black Reconstruction (1935) and Dusk of Dawn, subtitled *An Essay Toward an Autobiography of Race Concept* (1940).

Early in the 1940s he presented a plan for cooperative research between black land-grant colleges. Du Bois was clear that the studies of the black race could not be effectively carried out by one small college, and he had failed earlier in attracting any of the larger white institutions to join in. But he now firmly believed a consortium of black colleges could financially and professionally get the job done. The proposal for cooperative research was accepted by several black college presidents in 1942, with planning conferences held in 1943 and 1944. But before the project was fully funded, Du Bois was asked, much to his surprise, to retire from Atlanta University because he was 74 years old. In spite of his advanced age, he had fully expected to remain at Atlanta University and direct the cooperative research project, as one of his duties. It was not to be. So Du Bois had the project transferred to Howard University in 1944. E. Franklin Frazier was made its director. Frazier never received the funds and within 2 years, Du Bois' plan for an expanded study of American blacks collapsed. No one else was able to successfully take his place.

Despite his advanced age, when most men would have considered retirement, Du Bois returned to the NAACP where he served as chairman of the Peace Information Center. This center handled the publicity for the executive committee of the World Congress of the Defenders of Peace and circulated the "Stockholm Peace Appeal." This appeal demanded the outlawing of atomic weapons. Secretary of State Dean Acheson saw this as Soviet propaganda and demanded that the members of the Peach Information Center register as agents of a "foreign principal." Du Bois refused and was indicted under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. After the trial, in which Du Bois was acquitted, he became more and more alienated from American society in general and from the thinking of American blacks. Only the far left continued to claim this man whom one observer described as a "Prophet in Limbo" (Truman Nelson, 1958).

The impact of his travel on his thoughts and writings is significant. Du Bois traveled extensively. He studied and traveled in Germany in 1892. While there, he ventured out to England, France, Italy, and the Netherlands, Vienna, Budapest, Cracow, and Prague. He returned to Europe in 1900 and 1911. In 1923, Du Bois made his first trip to Africa, and in 1926 he visited the Soviet Union. On his way from the Soviet Union in 1936, Du Bois stopped in Japan and made his first visit to China. He returned to China in 1959.

The Pan-African Movement really got off the ground in 1945 when the liberation of colonies became a significant political issue. In response to Du Bois' announcement of a Fifth Pan-African Congress of 1945, 60 nations and colonies were represented in London, more than had attended any previous meeting. It was an effort towards unity and independence. Many were, however, skeptical of an American voice in leadership, even if it was Du Bois' voice, and decided to cast him in a largely ceremonial role as "Father of Pan-Africanism." Du Bois was not very pleased by that turn of events.

He often received acclaim in foreign lands, while his reputation at home waned. In the fall of 1959, while visiting the Soviet Union, he met with Prime Minister Nikita Khrushchev for 2 hours and discussed Africa, world peace, and ways to improve the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. While in Moscow, Du Bois was informed that he had won the International Lenin Peace Prize for 1959. It was given for his untiring activities in promoting friendship and cooperation among all peoples of the world. While traveling abroad, he received an honorary Doctorate of Historical Sciences from Charles University in Prague, and he was honored in China and enjoyed meeting Chairman Mao Tse-Tung.

In October, 1961, at the age of 93, having moved further and further into marginality by his beliefs in self-imposed segregation, Pan-Africanism, and socialism, Du Bois joined the Communist Party. President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana had invited Du Bois to return to Ghana permanently and direct the government-sponsored Encyclopedia Africana. He accepted

Nkrumah's invitation in late 1961 partly because of his alienation in America and partly because of the opportunity to fulfill a long-time scholarly dream--the development of the Encyclopedia Africana. Over a year later Du Bois became a Ghanian citizen (New York Times, February 20, 1963). On August 27, 1963, at the age of 95, W. E. B. Du Bois died in Accra, Ghana. He was buried outside Christianborg Castle, the Ghanian Government House.

Edwin Embree in 13 Against the Odds (1944) very poetically summarized Du Bois' life. He noted that Du Bois was a brown Brahmin:

> With talents and learning far above most of his white neighbors, he has been interned in the shadowy half world we have rigged up for the darker tenth of our population regardless of their individual merits. The segregation and the slights which beset this distinguished gentleman every day of his life in America have eaten into his soul. They have not stunted his mind, nor dulled his eloquence. They have simply turned the whole force of his keen and gifted personality into passionate warfare of color-caste in the United States and throughout the world. (p. 153)

He went on to say that Du Bois "with a pen dipped in gall" had written in trenchant and classic English what he had deeply felt and deeply studied. "The text of all his sermons and his deeds is 'color: the unfinished business of democracy.'"

Embree captures the spirit of Du Bois, as a marginal man, a brilliant scholar, poet, and writer. Du Bois, entangled by the web of segregation and discrimination, devoted his entire life and talents to the liberation of his core racial group in the United States and in the world.

Du Bois had published for 80 years. He wrote 3 books of fiction and 39 books of nonfiction; authored countless articles in newspapers, magazines, and periodicals; edited and published several periodicals himself; and, additionally, he wrote essays for many books edited and published by others. Some of his basic works will be examined in the next chapter.

Basic Works

Studies conducted by early black social scientists, especially Du Bois, who was the first black sociologist, were completed in an era of extreme racism. Blacks were excluded economically, politically, and socially and legally segregated from equal parity with whites. At the end of the Civil War, the Reconstruction era offered a glimmer of hope. Then, through a series of political maneuvers, blacks found themselves in a rapidly deteriorating situation. As the 19th century drew to a close, so did voting rights for many, and as the 20th century became an irascible fact of life, so did Jim Crow laws, farm tenancy, peonage, and lynching of mostly black Americans, for quite some time to come.

Labor unions excluded blacks from skilled trades. Race riots (whites against blacks) were very common in the North and in the South. With the exception of the slavery era, this was by far the most oppressive era for blacks in

America. It is not surprising that the study of the society became the career of several black intellectuals and the plight of blacks their obsession. Du Bois best captures this awakening of a marginal man, this realization of a color line that demanded the attention of the black intellectual generally, and the black sociologists specifically. Du Bois explained in Dusk of Dawn:

> In my life the chief fact has been race--not so much scientific race, as that deep conviction of myriads of men that congenital differences among the main masses of human beings absolutely condition the individual destiny of every member of a group. Into the spiritual provincialism of this belief I have been born and this fact has guided, embittered, illuminated, and enshrouded my life. (pp. 139-140)

It is the all-encapsulating issue of race, during the lives of Du Bois and the other sociologists studied in this dissertation, that makes their basic works an important window to their perspectives, ideologies, and aspirations for African Americans, as well as for themselves.

Though Du Bois directed or wrote a series of sociological monographs during his first tenure at Atlanta University, inadequate funding left this series uneven in quality and far from his best work. Therefore, included in this analysis are his sociological (and one historical) classics. The Philadelphia Negro, which was adequately funded, was the first holistic case study of a black community ever done in America. The Souls of Black Folk purported a theme which Du Bois held for a very long time, that the college-trained blacks should lead the race. It is also the source in which Du Bois launches his most direct attack on the strategies and goals of Booker T. Washington. Du Bois' most significant historical work, Black Reconstruction, is the historic classic included in this analysis. It is included because of the purpose he had for writing it and because of the significance he placed on history throughout a considerable amount of his work. Finally, the last book included is Dusk of Dawn: An Essay Toward an Autobiography of a Race Concept. It is an autobiographic essay which spells out his economic program for African Americans.

The Philadelphia Negro (1899) offers insight into the social strata, institutions, and varying lifestyles of a black community. It is a rigorous empirical monograph that sets forth specific proposals for racial advancement. In addition to his descriptions of Philadelphia's Seventh Ward, Du Bois saw as key problems the mass migration of young, impoverished, often illiterate Southerners into the slum of Philadelphia. Du Bois responded with five propositions for addressing the problems he had discovered. They were as follows:

> 1. The Negro is here to stay.
> 2. It is to the advantage of all, both black and white, that every Negro should make the best of himself.
> 3. It is the duty of the Negro to raise himself by every effort to the standards of modern civilization and not to lower those standards in any degree.

> 4. It is the duty of the white people to guard their civilization against debauchment by themselves or others; but in order to do this, it is not necessary to hinder and retard the efforts of an earnest people to rise, simply because they lack faith in the ability of that people.
> 5. With these duties in mind and with a spirit of self-help, mutual aid and cooperation, the two races should strive side by side to realize the ideals of the republic and make this truly a land of equal opportunity for all men. (pp. 388-389)

The Philadelphia Negro (1899) contrasted greatly with the racial belief held by most sociologists and the general public. He rejected explanations based on biological differences or inherent inferiority.

Joyce Ladner in The Death of White Sociology explained that before World War I (with the exception of W. I. Thomas) most sociological theory concerning race stressed belief in the biological superiority of whites and the "primitiveness" of the "inferior Negro's racial temperament" which predisposed him toward "shiftlessness and sensuality," thereby rendering him "inassimilable."

After World War I, these views were pervasive throughout sociological literature. Robert E. Park and Ernest Burgess in their renowned text, Introduction to the Science of Sociology (1924), stated that

> The temperament of the Negro as I conceive of it consists in a few elementary but distinctive characteristics, determined by physical organizations and transmitted biologically. These characteristics manifest themselves in a genial, sunny, and social disposition, in an interest in and attachment to external, physical things rather than to subjective states and objects of introspection, in a disposition for expression rather than enterprise and action. (pp. 138-139)

Edward B. Reuter in The American Race Problem (1927) offered justification for the poor quality of the so-called "racial temperament" of blacks. He said that blacks were

> without ancestral pride or family tradition. They had no distinctive language or religion. These, like their folkways and moral customs, were but recently acquired from the whites and furnished no nucleus for a racial unity. The group was without even a tradition of historic unity or of racial achievement. There were no historic names, no great achievements, no body of literature, no artistic products. The whole record of the race was one of servile or barbarian status apparently without a point about which a sentimental complex could be formed. (1970, p. 365)

Franz Boas believed that environment not race explains inequality of intellectual aptitude. Carter G. Woodson would later see it as a problem of historical inaccuracies. Du Bois, however, emphasized historical and environmental factors. His historical concerns led to his writing such works as Black Reconstruction, which will also be addressed in this dissertation. Meanwhile, Du Bois insisted on black self-help and solidarity, a program of racial self-elevation under the leadership of an educated black elite.

Du Bois' study (1899) revealed that three-fourths of the black working men in the Seventh Ward were "laborers and servants" and that about the same proportion of the women were employed as "day laborers and domestic servants." The color line in Philadelphia's many manufacturing plants was particularly glaring--about 8% of the blacks had factory jobs (pp. 101-102). The "mass of Negroes are in the economic world purveyors to the rich--working in private houses, in hotels, large stores, etc." (p. 296).

Most blacks were, therefore, engaged in low-paying jobs, and many could obtain only irregular work.

> Stevedores, hod-carriers and day-laborers are especially liable to irregular employment, which makes life hard for them sometimes. . . . The mass of men . . . meet their greatest difficulty in securing work. The competition in ordinary laboring work is severe in so crowded a city. The women day laborers are, on the whole, poorly paid, and meet fierce competition in laundry work and cleaning. (p. 133)

One-fourth of the men were employed in skilled trades, in the professions, and as small businessmen, providing the economic base for what Du Bois termed the city's small black "aristocracy." But, even the most successful black entrepreneurs--the barbers and the caterers--labored under harsh times. Barbering had once been "an almost exclusively Negro calling" but, by the end of the 19th century, competition by white immigrants was forcing blacks out of the lucrative white market. The "application of large capital to the catering business" had destroyed the position of the nationally famous black caterers who had previously dominated this business. Du Bois acknowledged, "If the Negro caterers of Philadelphia had been white, some of them would have been put in charge of a large hotel, or would have become co-partners in some large restaurant business, for which capitalists furnished funds" (p. 120).

Not surprisingly, the poor economic plight of blacks was reflected in the various "social problems"--illiteracy, "pauperism," crime, and family disorganization. The Philadelphia Negro also included vivid descriptions of the overcrowded squalor in which the city's black poor were forced to live. He discussed the disproportionate number of female-headed households among the black poor, indicating that the large number of women who described themselves as widowed, separated, deserted, and unmarried mothers as astoundingly large and presents many intricate problems (pp. 66-68). This situation, he explained, resulted partly from slavery and even more from harsh economic realities in the city.

"The low wages make it necessary for mothers to work and in numbers of cases to work away from home several days in the week. This leaves children without guidance or restraint for the better part of the day" (pp. 113-114). They were forced to rent out part of their dwellings to strangers, as lodgers, in order to pay the landlords.

> Thirty-eight percent of the homes in the Seventh Ward have unknown strangers admitted freely into their doors. The result is, on the whole, pernicious, especially where there are growing children. . . . The lodgers are often waiters, who are at home . . . at the very hours when the housewife is off at work, and growing daughters are thus left unprotected. . . . In such ways, the privacy and intimacy of home life is destroyed, and elements of danger and demoralization admitted. (pp. 193-194)

Du Bois identified three factors most responsible for this "pressing series of social problems":

(1) Slavery, which left so many of its victims untrained, uneducated, and impoverished.

(2) Prejudice. The relentless prejudice and discrimination of whites against blacks. The world of custom, the physical surroundings, and the discouragement which blacks encountered.

(3) Southern migrants. The large influx of ill-trained black migrants from the South.

Du Bois clearly expressed in _The Philadelphia Negro_ his feelings that blacks must lift themselves up. By racial cooperation, open enterprises could provide employment and training in trades and commerce. Whites had their duty to help, but society had too many problems "for it to lightly shoulder all of the burdens of a less advanced people." He admonished blacks to constantly register strong protests against prejudice and injustice, but they should do so because these things hindered them in their own attempt to elevate the race. This attempt Du Bois held must be marked by vigorous and persistent efforts directed toward lessening crime and toward inculcating self-respect, the dignity of labor, and the virtues of truth, honesty, and charity (1899, pp. 325, 388-391).

The Philadelphia Negro included Du Bois' leadership theory throughout it. It is evident that he believed that well-established blacks, who he called "the black aristocracy," should serve as the leaders of the race but noted that they had issues to address themselves. For example, he stated that they had a fear of being associated with the masses; they also had an unstable economic status, and they were insecure. Du Bois warned them that they could "hardly fulfill their duty as the leaders of the Negroes until they are captains of industry over their people, as well as richer and wiser" (p. 383).

The Souls of Black Folks was a compilation of Du Bois' experiences and analyses of the social milieu in which black Americans existed during the post-Reconstruction era. It captures, through several autobiographical sketches, the inner turmoil which Du Bois experienced as well as the external turmoil of black America. Du Bois is concerned, in this work, with specific social phenomena--leadership, social institutions, and social interaction. Though he largely uses essays in the form of case studies, he clearly projects the very nature of race relations.

Leadership was characterized in this era by Booker T. Washington. Souls of Black Folks (1903) presented the first tangible, articulate, and coherent argument against the direction which Washington felt blacks should go. This book represented an opposing perspective which allowed the educated faction of black America to be represented. William Ferris (1913) noted that this book became the "political bible" of educated blacks, and Du Bois would be seen as the "long-looked-for political messiah (p. 277).

Du Bois, in discussing the black college, noted that its function was to maintain the standards of higher education, seek the social regeneration of blacks, and help in the solution of problems of race contact and cooperation. But, beyond all this, he stated, "it must develop men." For to him the black college was charged with the responsibility of developing cultured, yet independent, individuals. Du Bois explained,

> And to make men, we must have ideals, broad, pure, and inspiring ends of living--not sordid money getting. . . . The worker must work for the glory of his handiwork, not simply for pay; the thinker must think for truth, not for fame. And all this is gained only by human strife and longing; by ceaseless training and education; by founding Right on righteousness and Truth on the unhampered search for Truth; by founding the common school on the university, and the industrial school on the common school; and weaving thus a system, not a distortion, and bringing a birth,, not an abortion. (Souls, 1903, p. 119)

In Du Bois' examination of the social interaction between blacks and whites after the Civil War, he indicates the need to decry color-prejudice. This, he said, cannot be laughed away and should not be encouraged by being left alone. Instead, it must be recognized as a fact that stands in the way of civilization, religion, and common decency. It is the basis of the color-line which divided the races and provided the rules of racial interaction. Du Bois wrote that the underlying causes of the situation are complicated but discernible. He mentions two key problems: (1) "the carelessness of the nation in letting the slave start with nothing," and (2) the widespread belief among merchants and employers of the South that only by the slavery of debt could blacks be kept at work (p. 175). In spite of these issues, however, there was hope, except as he explained on more than one occasion: "The best opinion of the South . . . is not the ruling opinion . . . to leave the Negro helpless and without a ballot [today] is to leave him, not to the guidance of the best, but to the exploitation and debauchment of the worst" (Souls, p. 199).

Of the color-line, he writes that to a casual observer to the South, it may not at first be apparent, but eventually

> he meets crowds of Negroes and Negroes and whites: then he is suddenly aware that he cannot discover a single dark face; or again at the close of a day's wandering he may find himself in some strange assembly, where all faces are tinged with brown or black, and where he has the vague, uncomfortable feeling of the stranger. He realizes at least that silently, resistlessly, the world about flows by him in two great streams: they ripple on the same sunshine, they approach and mingle their waters in seemingly carelessness--then they divide and flow wide apart. It is done quietly; no mistakes are made, or if one occurs, the swift arm of the law and of public opinion swings down for a moment, as when the other day a black man and a white woman were arrested for talking together on Whitehall Street in Atlanta. (Souls, 1903, p. 204)

It was also in Souls of Black Folk that Du Bois first wrote of his concern that blacks might be swept away by the lures of capitalism. In his essay, "Of the Wings of Atlanta," he asked,

> What if the Negro people be wooed from a strife for righteousness, from a love of knowing, to regard dollars as the be-all and end-all of life? Whither, then, is the new world quest for goodness and Beauty and Truth gone glimmering? Must this, and that fair flower of freedom which . . . spring from our fathers' blood, must that too degenerate into a dusky quest of gold? (p. 69)

Du Bois, as a marginal man, saw himself as a leader of the black race, a race that had a mission. His theme of black solidarity is understated in Souls of Black Folks; his belief in the mission of the race is clear. He writes,

> Work, culture, liberty--all these we need . . . each growing and aiding each, and all striving toward that vaster ideal that swims before the Negro people, the ideal of human brotherhood, gained through the unifying ideal of race . . . that someday on American soil two world-races may give to each other those characteristics both so sadly lack.

For historians, Du Bois' most important work was Black Reconstruction. In the Preface of this book, Du Bois tells his readers that he meant to retell the history of the years between 1860 and 1880 "with especial reference to the efforts and experiences of the Negroes themselves." He further noted that he was "going to tell this story as though Negroes were ordinary human beings, realizing that this attitude will from the first seriously curtail my audience." In the text of this book Du Bois explains why this particular work was necessary. He stated that he was "literally aghast" at what racist historiography had done in this field (p. 725). His work would serve as an important and necessary corrective source.

Du Bois' original title for this book was Black Reconstruction of Democracy in America. His publisher asked him to shorten the title. As a result, he shortened the name but insisted that the title page hold the following subtitle: "An Essay toward a History of the Part which Black Folk Played in the Attempt to Reconstruct Democracy in America, 1860-1880."

Du Bois' book does not begin with the Reconstruction era; instead, it starts with the Civil War. He started there to serve to main purposes: first, to illustrate the significant role played by blacks in preserving the Union and in emancipating themselves and, second, to demonstrate the continuity of the struggle against slavery, which included the advent of the Civil War and the Reconstruction effort.

Du Bois' concern with the exploitation of the lower classes, specifically, and interest in Socialism, generally, is also reflected in this book. He writes that "one sees the old snobbery of class judgment in new form--tears and sentiment for Marie Antoinette on the scaffold, but no sign of grief for the gutters of Paris and the field of France, where the victims of exploitation and ignorance lay rotting in piles" (p. 206). There seems to be a concerted effort on his part to relate Marxist theory to the Reconstruction era.

Du Bois also mentions in his book that he had originally entitled Chapter Ten "The Dictatorship of the Black Proletariat in South Carolina," but he changed it to "The

Black Proletariat in South Carolina." He noted that he changed it because it was brought to his attention (probably by Abram L. Harris and Benjamin Stolberg) that the former title was incorrect. Du Bois, however, in a letter written to Stolberg, explained why he had selected the original title in the first place (1934):

> My reason for this is that in South Carolina, beginning in 1867, there were distinct evidences of a determination on the part of the black laborers to tax property and administer the state primarily for the benefit of labor. This was not only a conscious ideal but it would lead to heavy taxing on land, to the buying of large tracts of land to be distributed among the poor, and to many direct intelligent statements of the object of these policies.

Du Bois went on further to remark in that letter to Stolberg (1934) that the country and the state were not ready for the dictatorship of the proletariat which may have come in through later development and in other surroundings.

There were other elements in Du Bois' book that allowed some of his critics to simply dismiss it as the writings of a Marxist, including his portrayal of black run-away slaves who joined the Union army as going on a general strike against the South, thereby depriving the South of its vital labor force.

He also dispelled the myth that the North unilaterally sought to end slavery because of humanitarian reasons. He wrote,

> The North was not Abolitionist. It was overwhelmingly in favor of Negro slavery, so long as this did not interfere with Northern

> moneymaking. But, on the other hand, there was a minority of the North who hated slavery with perfect hatred; who wanted no union with slaveholders; who fought for freedom and treated Negroes as men. As the Abolition-democracy gained in prestige and power, they appeared as prophets, and led by statesmen, they began to guide the nation out of the morass into which it had fallen. They and their black friends and the new freedmen became gradually the leaders of a Reconstruction of Democracy in the United States.

When asked the theme of Black Reconstruction, Du Bois wrote in Phylon, IV (1943):

> To me, these propositions, extreme as they may sound, seem clear and true:
>
> 1. The American Negro not only was the cause of the Civil War but a prime factor in enabling the North to win it.
> 2. The Negro was the only effective tool which could be used for the immediate restoration of the federal union after the war.
> 3. The enfranchisement of the freedmen after the war was one of the greatest steps toward democracy taken in the nineteenth century.
> 4. The attempts to retrace that step, disenfranchising the Negro and reducing him to caste conditions, are the deeds which make the South today the nation's social problem Number One.

The key merit of Black Reconstruction is the portrayal of African Americans' contributions during an era previously depicted as completely disorganized and chaotic. This work was an antidote to the vast number of volumes that characterized the postwar Southern black as ignorant and dishonest men who created major headaches for the supporters of good government.

Dusk of Dawn, subtitled An Essay Toward an Autobiography of Race Concept, was Du Bois' first autobiography. It was published in 1940. At that time, Du Bois was 72 years old.

But, it is less of an autobiography than it is an effort to demonstrate the intricacies and complexities of the race problem by explaining it in terms of the one life he knew best. So, he sought to explain his role in both the African and African American struggles for freedom. He saw his own career as an ideological case study illustrating the Negro-white conflict.

In a chapter entitled "The Concept of Race," Du Bois clearly conveys his strong feeling about Africa. These were feelings which he found difficult to understand. He concluded,

> My African racial feeling was then purely a matter of my own later learning and reaction; my recoil from the assumptions of the whites; my experience in the South at Fisk. I felt myself African by "race" and by that token was African and an integral member of the group of dark Americans who were called Negroes. (1940, p. 44)

Du Bois, the marginal man, most clearly sought to be identified with people of color.

On the other hand, Du Bois' marginality was evident. Though he was consumed with a love for Africa, he had also been overwhelmed by German culture and people. It is in Dusk of Dawn where he first wrote of a love affair in Germany. He explained,

> I had already told the daughter, Dora, with whom I was most frequently coupled, that it would not be fair to marry her and bring her to America. She said she would marry me "gleich!' [at once] but I assured her that she would not be happy; and besides, I had work to do. (1940, p. 46)

The "friendships and close contacts with white folk made my own ideas waver" (pp. 101-102) wrote Du Bois of his German experience. His experience caused him to question his distrust and disdain of whites.

It is also in Dusk of Dawn that Du Bois begins to adjust his position on self-imposed segregation and nationalism. On the one hand, he upheld the notion of a separate black economy as "not so easily dismissed" because "in the first place we have already got a partially separate economy in the United States" (p. 97). But, on the other hand, he went on to remark that his economic program for the advancement of blacks in America "can easily be mistaken for a program of complete racial segregation and even nationalism among Negroes. This he said was "a misapprehension."

Here was a marginal man who came to the realization that while it was necessary to agitate for equality, the agitation would be slow and painful; in fact, he asserted that for blacks their "present racial segregation [will] persist for many decades" (pp. 193-194). Racism, he concluded, was not totally the result of ignorance and deliberate maliciousness on the part of whites. Instead, there was, fundamentally, deeply ingrained customs and patterns rooted in frequently unconscious economic motives. To whites, blacks were a resource to be exploited ruthlessly--and racism facilitated this exploitation. The degradation of blacks, by whites, placed blacks outside of the realm of normal moral or humanistic treatment. This deeper cause of racism would persist for a very long time. As a result, it was essential that blacks developed the inner economic and social strength of the black community.

Du Bois promoted economic development, but he opposed any program of black capitalism on the grounds that this "will have inserted into the ranks of the Negro race a new cause of division, a new attempt to subject the masses of the race to an exploiting capitalist class of their own people" (p. 208). Instead, he insisted on the principle of democracy being applied to economic relations. Du Bois (1940) wrote,

> I had been brought up with the democratic idea that [the] general welfare was the object of democratic action in the state, of allowing the governed a voice in government. But through the crimson illumination of war, I realized and, afterward by traveling around the world, saw even more clearly that so-called democracy today was allowing the mass of people to have only a limited voice in government; that democratic control of what are at present the most important functions of men: work and earning a living and distributing goods and services; that here we did not have democracy; we had oligarchy, and this oligarchy was determined to deny democracy in industry in legislation and choice of officials. (p. 285)

Du Bois, therefore, called for "economic planning to insure adequate income" to members of the community, establishment of consumer unions, elimination of private profit in merchandising operations, a planned system of black hospitals and socialized medicine; cooperative organization of black professionals so that they could provide service to all in need without regard to their own personal profit, and the establishment of a black-controlled educational system. Du Bois' plan had several other components, but, in essence, what he proposed was the creation of a planned, communal social system for, of, and by African Americans.

Planning was necessary so that all significant aspects could be thought out, analyzed, and carefully guided in order to properly facilitate community development. It would be communal in that property relations would become social rather than private. Communal also in that it would foster the strengthening of the black family and community, so that blacks would become dedicated to the welfare of the group rather than individual gain.

The cost of this "cooperative commonwealth" would have to rest on the shoulders of the black community itself, not by whites or white-dominated institutions, thereby eliminating the stranglehold of racism and economic exploitation. Du Bois understood that some people may object to this aspect of his plan, presenting the case that the black community does not possess sufficient resources to support such a program. This problem could be overcome through the political organization of the entire community. Du Bois, unfortunately, did not explain how this would be done or through what organization. At the same time, blacks did not have control over all of the essential goods and services necessary for the survival of this self-sufficient black socio-economic structure.

In Dusk of Dawn, Du Bois merged a black nationalism with radical socialism. He mentioned in this work that "there faces the American Negro therefore an intricate and subtle problem of combining into one object two difficult sets of facts." He was referring to integrationism (civil rights, racial equality, freedom) on the one hand, versus nationalism (self-segregation, economic determinism, self-help) on the other hand. This theoretical formulation of historic conflict between these tendencies was first presented by this marginal man, Du Bois, who from his marginal vantage point, saw and felt, within himself, both warring directions.

Reception

As mentioned in Chapter II, Du Bois was a bit older than the other black sociologists of the early 20th century. Du Bois received a Ph.D. from Harvard even before they had a program in sociology there. Du Bois, as marginal men often are, always seemed to be just ahead of, or just afield from, everyone else throughout his long life. This would play a key role in how he was perceived and received. Though he always seemed to want to be a leader of his race, he seemed to accept rather early in his career that being a leader may initially require being a maverick, stepping out with ideals and ideas that were not necessarily easy for others to swallow but, from his extensive research and observations, seemed the most logical.

Who besides Du Bois would through a book (The Souls of Black Folk) take a definitive public stand against the powerful and vindictive Booker T. Washington? Who besides Du Bois, one of the founding members of the NAACP (an organization dedicated to integration) could take a stand for voluntary segregation of blacks in America? Who besides Du Bois could be indicted, then acquitted, for refusing to register as an agent of a "foreign principal" because of his work as the chairman of the Peace Information Center? Finally, who besides Du Bois would, at the age of 92, join the Communist Party and, at 94, become a Ghanian citizen? These demonstrated his belief in Pan Africanism and an equalitarian world order and a contempt for the status quo. Some of his ideals were perhaps unrealistic. But his desire for knowledge, truth, and justice served him well his entire life.

Of course, Du Bois paid a heavy price for his heightened marginality. Blacks, for the most part, could not relate to him. Whites, for the most part, could not understand him. Early white sociologists ignored him; early black sociologists studied his words but rarely sought his friendship. No one was able to join him at every juncture or follow his every lead. The isolation, the marginality, he felt was very real.

Make no mistake about him, however, his mission was clear. His basic premise sound. On the occasion of his 25th birthday, while in Germany, he made his tripartite dedication of his life to seeking Truth, to the rise of the Negro race, and to the best development of the world. At the same time, Du Bois realized that his all-consuming racial pride may have colored his perceptions in Black Folk: Then and Now (1939). He wrote,

> I do not for a moment doubt that my Negro descent and narrow group culture have in many cases predisposed me to interpret my facts too favorably for my race; but there is little danger of long misleading here, for the champions of white folk are legion. The Negro had long been the clown of history; the football of anthropology; and the slave of industry. I am trying to show here why these attitudes can no longer be maintained. I realize that the truth of history lies not in the mouths of partisans but rather in the calm Science that sits between. Her cause I seek and wherever I fail, I am at least paying Truth the respect of earnest effort. (p. ix)

Yet, bias towards blacks was generally not the main criticism offered by whites or blacks for his relative lack of acceptance, into either camp, during his life. As indicated in Chapter II, Du Bois was cited more frequently than any other black sociologist in Race Relations textbooks between 1945 and 1965 but was not among the top 10 sociologists cited most frequently in scholarly sociological journals between 1944 and 1968. Du Bois ranked 16th (Bahr, Johnson, & Seitz, 1971).

Now for a look at the reception of his basic works. The Philadelphia Negro was reviewed by several periodicals, one of which was the Nation, which noted that Du Bois' work was a "very exhaustive study" but "too gloomy." The reviewer wondered why the number of Southern black migrants was so high if things were as bad as Du Bois indicated. The reviewer apparently was not aware of many of the problems and conditions of the South. This reviewer went on to say that capable black servants were prized by their employers. As a result, domestic labor did not need to be "degrading." The reviewer completely missed Du Bois' point that many blacks had been excluded from positions for which they were qualified and, therefore, were forced to take domestic jobs which offered low social status, low pay, and often caring for the children of whites, while their own children roamed the streets.

The American Historical Review noted that Du Bois was "perfectly frank, laying all necessary stress on the weakness of his people. . . . If any conclusions are faulty, the fault lies in the overweight given to some of his beliefs and hopes."

The Yale Review called The Philadelphia Negro "a credit to American scholarship and a distinct and valuable addition to the world's stock of knowledge concerning an important and obscure theme" (p. 110). The Outlook reported, "In no respect does Dr. Du Bois attempt to bend the facts so as to plead for his race. . . . All that his [N]egro sympathies insure is that redeeming facts as well as damning ones shall be brought out. For the latter, he is less apologetic than a generous-minded white writer might be."

Dan S. Green and Edwin D. Driver edited a collection of W. E. B. Du Bois' sociological writings. This work by Green and Driver is entitled W. E. B. Du Bois on Sociology and the Black Community. The essays and excerpts of works included in this volume were written by Du Bois between 1899 and 1944. A selection from Du Bois' The Philadelphia Negro (1899) is included and serves as the backdrop for many of the concerns pursued in his later sociological works. Du Bois' sociological works reflect his beliefs during that period that racial problems in the United States could possibly be ameliorated through careful scientific study. Du Bois' scholastic dream was that several American universities would commit themselves to jointly establish a project for the continual study of race relations. He saw this project as a way to address racial conflict in America. Du Bois also believed, prior to 1944, that the role of the scholar was to collect and analyze data, not to engage in social reform. A critic of the Green and Driver volume remarked that "this well-edited collection is too technical for the general reader but useful to students of black studies." Du Bois' writings often fell somewhere between historian/sociologist. Perhaps as an indicator of marginality he took painstaking efforts to present the data as completely as he could, bringing in technical detail that would leave little question as to what he was saying.

Between 1904 and 1944 Du Bois moved from scholar to propagandist to scholar again. Part of the frustration he endured as a scholar was the lack of major funds for his proposed long-term study of race and race relations in America. Even though The Philadelphia Negro was completed with adequate funds, Du Bois had envisioned that work as only part one of a series. Funds were not available for the kinds of follow-up studies he planned. The studies that followed, therefore, were on a much smaller scale.

However, The Philadelphia Negro (1899) was reissued in 1968. That year The Times Literary Supplement published an issue on Sociology. A review of The Philadelphia Negro (1899:1968) appeared in that issue. The reviewer stated (April 4, 1968) the following:

> The Du Bois study is not merely highly intelligent, it reflects in some ways in Du Bois a criticism of his "race" (an ambiguous term in one of so mixed if not at all "Anglo-Saxon" ancestry). . . . Du Bois saw, admired, and practiced white bourgeois virtues or cultural traits, even if he was already moving away from the acceptance of an inferior role involved, for that generation at least, in the theory and practice of Booker T. Washington. But Du Bois was not contracting out of American society, and when he became a Marxist, he was not contracting out of present capitalist or future Communist America. He was no Negro Narodnick. (p. 329)

This book review of The Philadelphia Negro quickly degenerated into an analysis of the life of W. E. B. Du Bois. Perhaps the mixture of his ancestry, his haughty nature, his move to the Communist Party--and all of the other underpinnings of his marginality defied no comment. However, the view that Du Bois "saw, admired and practiced white bourgeois virtues" is not quite accurate. Clearly his Great Barrington, Massachusetts, upbringing, his study in Germany, and his international travel suggest that he started learning those virtues from childhood and refined and maintained them throughout his adult life.

The Souls of Black Folk (1903), first edition, was basically ignored. Reviews appeared in several popular magazines but in only two scholarly journals. The American Academy of Political and Social Science (1903, vol. 22) and in the American Journal of Sociology (1903-04). Both reviews were favorable.

Theophilus Steward, who wrote the review for the American Journal of Sociology, seemed to understand the goals and wrote that Du Bois

> has shown a depth of sympathetic investigation and a purposeful expression which everywhere strive with the reader and influence him to the thought that now we are coming to a systematic discussion and an intelligent striving from which shall ultimately be born that time, long written of and striven for when all men shall enjoy the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. (p. 137)

The same reviewer, however, was not devoid of the stereotypes of the era and gleaned, from his perspective, perpetuation of some of them in Du Bois book. Of Du Bois' most eloquent portrayal of the feelings of blacks, which he entitled "Of Our Spiritual Strivings," the reviewer interprets that chapter this way:

> The author is at his best in an unbiased consideration of the [N]egro's emotional nature. . . . That there can be no doubt of the preponderance of misdirected emotionalism is evidenced in the rapidity with which the negro swings from love to hate, from laughter to tears. (p. 136)

The marginal man was often ignored or misinterpreted. It is perhaps why Du Bois identified the issue of being "behind the veil" or behind the "plate glass," as well as the problems of ignorance, misinformation, and misinterpretations. Du Bois attempted addressing this complexity of the plate glass by frequently producing his work (the facts of his life experiences and his research) by writing a variety of forms and formats. He conducted scientific studies, wrote propaganda, polemics, poetry, and plays attempting to use his talents to extend his influence. Still, it was not unusual for scholars and laymen to make assessments based on generally accepted assumptions and, thereby, illuminating the prism through which these marginal men were viewed.

Black Reconstruction in America was subtitled An Essay Toward a History of the Part Which Black Folk Played in the Attempt to Reconstruct Democracy in America, 1860-1880. Herbert Aptheker noted that different historians such as Harvey Wish and Carl Degler believed that by the time Du Bois wrote Black Reconstruction he had become a Marxist. Rembert W. Patrick wrote that Du Bois was "not a Marxian" when he wrote the book. Howard K. Beale felt it was "fairer" to call Du Bois a "quasi Marxist." Aptheker noted

> Having found Du Bois described as a confirmed Marxist, a plain Marxist, a quasi Marxist, and not a Marxist we have perhaps exhausted the possibilities. Du Bois was a Du Boisite. His political affiliations or affinities varied as times changed, as programs altered, and as he changed.

Du Bois did take a more serious look at the writings of Marx during the 1930s. It is also evident that he did seek to combine his views of socialist theory and his historical method. Du Bois sought a dramatic way to present historical facts about black participation in this epoch of American history. From as early as 1927, Du Bois intentionally stayed on the periphery of the Communists, but the end of slavery and the Black Reconstruction era he portrayed as a struggle between rich and poor, with blacks as slaves, runaways and freedmen serving as the vanguards of the struggle for the poor. As a result, Marxist critics applauded Black Reconstruction while non-Marxist critics tended to hate it.

Avery Craven's review of the Black Reconstruction, which appeared in The American Journal of Sociology was among the negative reviews. He saw the book, for the most part, as "only the expression of a Negro's bitterness against the injustice of slavery and racial prejudice" (1936, p. 635). Others, like Craven, could not see what Du Bois was trying to do. Du Bois, perhaps in anticipation that some may wonder why he took on this project, said,

> The opportunity to study a great human experiment was present in Reconstruction, and its careful scientific investigation would have thrown a world

> of light on human development and democratic government. (1935, p. 383)

Du Bois went on to explain the difficulty he had with such a project:

> The material today, however, is unfortunately difficult to find. Little effort has been made to preserve the records of Negro effort and speeches, actions, work and wages, homes and families. Nearly all this has gone down beneath a mass of ridicule and caricature, deliberate omission and misstatement. (1935, p. 383)

Yet, almost in anticipation of detractors about his book, he writes,

> The loss today is irreparable, and this present limps and gropes in darkness, lacking most essentials to a complete picture; and yet the writer is convinced that this is the story of a normal working class movement, successful to an unusual degree, despite all disappointment and failure. (1935, p. 383)

Many critics, like Craven, could not see beyond a "Negro's rage." Therefore, they were unable to assess the book on the merits of the work itself. Continually, however, Du Bois pointed out the ludicrousness of prejudging an entire race, first by examples of his life and abilities, and second by uncovering the facts. Du Bois does express his rage against racist historians; in fact, he devotes the entire last chapter (of Black Reconstruction) entitled, "The Propaganda of History," to an indictment of history, concerning the Reconstruction era, as a collection of lies, misconceptions, innuendos, and omissions. This marginal man definitely does express rage, but not so much at the injustice of slavery, but as the scholar that he was at the misrepresentation of the facts.

As Herbert Aptheker pointed out in the introduction of the 1975 edition of Du Bois' 1940 book, Dusk of Dawn, reviews of the first edition were "prompt, numerous, and almost without exception, highly laudatory." Even an old nemesis of Du Bois', Oswald Garrison Villard, wrote a rather balanced account of Dusk of Dawn in The Saturday Review (October 12, 1940). Villard had been a strong supporter of Booker T. Washington with Du Bois from that era. But Villard was impressed with Du Bois' objective presentation of his differences with Booker T. Washington. Villard also highly touted the chapter entitled "The White World." Villard also worked with Du Bois earlier in the founding of the NAACP. Yet, Villard could not resist making at least one acerbic remark; perhaps feeling excluded from the autobiographical essay himself, he wrote "the very real egotism which shines through these pages in which few others are praised--chiefly those who contributed to his success" (1940, p. 26).

The reviewer for the American Sociological Review, Guy B. Johnson, was particularly impressed with the three periods of Du Bois' thinking and activity. First, Du Bois felt that the approach to the race problem was one of science. Second, militant struggle for black civil rights through the courts, "through organization, propaganda, boycott." Third, "developing to the utmost efficiency" the segregated institutions of blacks. Johnson extolled the merit of this book and insisted that it must be "required reading for all who study the problem of human relations."

It is also in Dusk of Dawn that Du Bois makes a critical analysis of the black community. Du Bois noted that "this is still an ignorant people." He wrote that the more educated man is "jammed beside the careless, ignorant and criminal." Progress, Du Bois stated, is hindered by "unwashed and unshaven black demagogues." The best class of African Americans are often corrupted by "crime, gambling and prostitution" whenever they attempt getting employment for their people through political machinery. Such scathing indictment of segments of the black community are reminiscent of only Du Bois' early works such as The Philadelphia Negro (1898).

There is no question that Dusk of Dawn was Du Bois most renowned work. Perhaps it was his projection of voluntary self-segregation, or his scrutiny of the black community, or maybe his assertion of a "Blood" relation to whites, or maybe it was the more conciliatory, accommodationist tone that made Dusk of Dawn more palatable to more people.

Conclusions

According to the Bahr, Johnson, and Seitz study of 1971 (see Chapter II) between 1944-1968, W. E. B. Du Bois ranked 16th among the most frequently referenced scholars in 10 major sociological journals. However, none of his books were among the top 25 (see p. 17). Of citations listed in the International Index to Periodicals comparing the four scholars studied in this dissertation, Du Bois ranked third between 1915 and 1968.

Though Du Bois wrote prolifically and was pretty well known, his books were basically ignored. In general social science indices Du Bois fared better than in the sociological journals mainly because his works, such as The Suppression of the African Slave Trade and Black Reconstruction, were much more useful to historical works. Others, such as his work entitled The Negro, lends itself much more readily to African affairs.

Yet, in the international index, Du Bois ranked third in the comparison of the four between 1915 and 1968. Though no particular book of Du Bois ranks high in the journal citations, he was the most frequently cited scholar in 112 Race and Race Relations textbooks between 1924-1965. He is surpassed by E. Franklin Frazier from 1966-1986.

In 144 introductory sociology textbooks, Du Bois was cited only one percentage point more frequently than Cox, who was least cited in general introductory textbooks. Interestingly enough, between 1924-1944 Du Bois was cited most frequently, second only to Charles S. Johnson in general introductory sociological textbooks. After 1944, however, he would slip to third and remain there to 1986.

Table 4 takes a look at the only three black sociology textbooks found by 1987. Du Bois appeared as either the most frequently cited or the second most frequently cited in all three. Even though the citations are lower in number in these journals, it is probably because all three books were published after Du Bois' death in 1963.

Though he was ignored by his field, he could not be forgotten by social sciences in general. Perhaps his changes through Talented Tenth, two-ness, Niagara Movement, Pan Africanism, civil rights struggles, voluntary self-segregation, socialism, communism, Ghanian citizenship made this marginal man, Du Bois, difficult to earmark. Historian or Sociologist? Poet or Novelist? Propagandist or Scientist? Perhaps all, and, therefore, not garnering full acceptance by any of them.

Du Bois was a marginal man caught "behind a veil," a veil that solidified for him, into a "plate glass," by the mid-20th century. Marginal men exist on the periphery of two cultures "never quite able to break with his past even if permitted to do so," yet not quite accepted "because of racial prejudice in the new society. As a young man, Du Bois felt that the masses of blacks should be led by a cadre of black intellectuals. He was convinced that the college-trained blacks had an obligation to train the masses socially, academically, and culturally. Du Bois also believed very strongly in "civil rights" for backs, "voting rights," the "education of youth according to ability."

For, at the beginning of his career, he strongly believed that the main cause of racism was ignorance. So, for a long time, he pursued the development of scientific research projects which would provide the world with a body of continually evolving comprehensive facts about blacks in America, believing that the facts would dispel the myths and allow truth to eliminate misguided myths and stereotypes. Also, he felt a responsibility and commitment to uncovering truth. Du Bois was committed to science and saw the search for cause and effect as invaluable in his quest for the establishment of truth on which "Right in the Future might be built" (Black Reconstruction, 1935, p. 725).

The Philadelphia Negro was a strong testament to his aim. E. Digby Baltzell, professor of sociology at the University of Pennsylvania, wrote in a long introduction to the 1967 reprint of The Philadelphia Negro that the reviews at the time of publication "invariably praised the book and remarked on the objectivity of the author." In fact, between the lines, one has the impression that most of the white reviewers were rather surprised that a Negro author could have been capable of a work of such careful scholarship and objectivity. Gunnar Myrdal's An American Dilemma stated that The Philadelphia Negro met the highest requirements for the study of a Negro but is "all but forgotten." Yet, Gunnar

Myrdal did not see it necessary to invite Du Bois to contribute a study to An American Dilemma.

Du Bois was granted a special fellowship to conduct a research project in Philadelphia's Seventh Ward slums by the Provost of the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. Charles C. Harrison. Even with his Harvard Ph.D. in hand, he said he was given the rank of "assistant instructor," and he was not listed in the University of Pennsylvania's catalog. However, that would be as close as he would come to an appointment at any predominantly white institution. He would not even receive a visiting professorship at any predominantly white college or university his entire life.

Du Bois was often ahead of everyone else. He advocated black self-determination long before the Black Panthers arrived on the scene. He suggested the establishment of black cooperatives, which so impressed Booker T. Washington that he adopted the idea in his development of the National Business League. Also, many years later, Harold Cruse, following Du Bois' economic plan and Du Bois' early suggestion that the leadership of the race should come from the black intellectuals, devised a plan for Harlem. Cruse felt, however, that black intellectuals and a new black middle class should play key roles in its implementation.

Du Bois, as marginal men often are, was also sometimes far afield of everyone else. His plan of self-segregation perhaps can be interpreted as at least taken in part by groups like the early Black Muslims. But most groups of this ilk believed that blacks should separate from whites with an eye toward leaving America, as in the case of the back to Africa movements. Du Bois did not support this idea.

Black was not a popular term for African Americans to use in order to refer to themselves. For this reason, Du Bois used "black" regularly and deliberately attempting to nullify the negative stigma. It was Du Bois who continually tried to awaken interest in the study of Africa, leading by example rather than by preachment. His most ardent critics accused him of being a talker instead of a doer. His admirers say that Du Bois was a maker of history. Of himself he wrote in his final note to the world, a note that was read at his funeral,

> I have loved my work, I have loved people and my play, but always I have been uplifted by the thought that what I have done well will live long and justify my life; that what I have done ill or never finished can now be handed on to others for endless days to be finished, perhaps better than I could have done. And that peace will be my applause. . . .

CHAPTER IV
CHARLES SPURGEON JOHNSON

Biography

Charles S. Johnson was born July 24, 1893, in Bristol, Virginia. Of the four scholars investigated, Johnson was the only southerner. He was the eldest of six children of Charles Henry and Winifred [Branch] Johnson. Charles Henry Johnson was a Baptist minister who was also an emancipated slave. He had been tutored by his master and later went on to receive his B.D. degree from Richmond Institute. Charles Henry exposed his son to the classics of western literature, theology, and history.

Johnson later recalled his first encounter with Jim Crowism, which separated and dehumanized its captives. The incident occurred at a soda fountain which he frequented with his mother. On this occasion, the store owner told his mother that he could no longer serve them at the counter. He never forgot the humiliation and frustration of his mother as she tried to explain to him why they could not stop at the soda fountain ever again.

There were no high schools for blacks in Bristol, Virginia, so, at the age of 14, Johnson was sent to attend Wayland Academy in Richmond, Virginia, the high school attached to Virginia Union University. Johnson graduated from Virginia Union with honors in 1916, 3 years after he started attending classes there. In 1917, he went to study at the University of Chicago. There, he became associated with Robert E. Park, who became a lifelong mentor, teacher, and friend to him. Other professors such as W. I. Thomas, Albion Small, Ernest Burgess, and Ellsworth Faris made an impact on the young, intelligent Johnson. Burgess described Johnson as an excellent student of "unusual ability, energy and originality." Johnson received his Ph.B. (Bachelor of Philosophy) from the University of Chicago in 1918 and later received several honorary degrees. He later served as director of research and records (1917-1919) of the Chicago Urban League where Park was president. Johnson's work was interrupted briefly by his activity in the United States Army. He served as a regimental sergeant major in France, where he participated in the Meuse-Argonne offensive. At the end of the war, he returned to Chicago in 1919.

In the summer of the year that he returned from fighting, Chicago experienced the worst race riots in the nation's history to that date. Johnson, perhaps being in the wrong place, at the wrong time, was almost killed during one of the riots. After these disastrous riots, at the insistence of the NAACP and the Urban League, the Chicago Commission on Race Relations was formed. Johnson was probably the best and most obvious candidate to head this

Commission. Instead, however, a white educator by the name of Graham Taylor was given the position of Executive Director. Johnson was assigned the "Associated Executive Secretary." His responsibility was to conduct the basic research. The result of his research was the Commission Report, The Negro In Chicago: A Study of Race Relations and a Race Riot.

In a bibliography of Johnson's works, compiled by George L. Gardiner, Gardiner asserted (1960):

> Although the authorship is credited to the Chicago Commission on Race Relations, the compilation of materials and writing was mainly the work of Charles S. Johnson. Partial evidence of this is found in "Public Opinion and the Negro," a manuscript by [Johnson], used as background material for The Negro in Chicago and in the acknowledgement for the chapter, "The 1919 Chicago Race Riot," in Social Problems in America, by Alfred McClung Lee and Elizabeth F. Lee. (p. 6)

In 1921, Johnson moved to New York as the Director of Research and Investigations for the National Urban League. In 1923 he also became editor of the National Urban League's new magazine, Opportunity: A Journal of Negro Life. The poet, Countee Cullen, served as assistant editor. As editor, Johnson was concerned with presenting social science research to black readers for the purpose of allowing those blacks who were able to use their various talents to serve as an inspiration and ray of hope to others. As a result, Opportunity became a forum for research and the investigations of the Urban League. At the same time, it was a showcase for black writers, poets, and artists of the

"Harlem Renaissance." Contributions from literary figures and artists such as Alain L. Locke, Claude McKay, Langston Hughes, Countee Cullen, Aaron Douglas, Arna Bontemps, and James Weldon Johnson were found side by side with sociological contributions from E. Franklin Frazier, Ellsworth Faris, and Edward B. Reuter.

When Johnson took on the role of literary critic, he showed how the sociologist is not impeded from getting inside the work itself simply because he is primarily concerned with context. As a social critic, Johnson's own works displayed his sharp insight and tightly controlled anger. These qualities would become symbolic of his style.

Charles S. Johnson left the National Urban League in 1928 to become chairman of the Social Science Department at Fisk University. At the beginning of his tenure at Fisk, he also took a position as research secretary for the National Interracial Conference in Washington, D.C. The research data collected were published by the conference as The Negro in American Civilization: A Study of Negro Life and Race Relations in the Light of Social Research (1930). As chairman of the Social Science Department at Fisk, Johnson made his greatest sociological contributions through conferences, books, monographs, papers, and memoranda. He published the Fisk University Press monographs, and in 1936 he brought Robert E. Park to the Fisk staff as visiting professor of sociology.

In 1931 he coordinated President Hoover's special commission on Negro housing and home building. Johnson served on a large number of commissions and advisory boards. He was head of the Southern Rural Division, Negro Youth Study for the American Youth Commission and the Council of Education. The data he collected under that role was published as *Growing Up in the Black Belt: Negro Youth in the Rural South* (1941). In 1936 he was a member of the League of Nations Commission to investigate forced labor in Liberia.

After World War II he served with President Truman's commission for the reorganization of education in Japan. Johnson also served as a member of the first delegation to UNESCO in Paris and on the United States Commission for UNESCO. From 1943 to 1948 he edited *A Monthly Summary of Events and Trends in Race Relations* (later called *Race Relations*), a magazine that was the outgrowth of a confidential request from President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In January 1943, Johnson began his Race Relations Department at Fisk University. During the first year of the program, Johnson and his staff concentrated their work in racially tense areas. Generally, the Race Relations team was brought in by concerned agencies in the various communities to study racial situations centered around such issues as population mobility, industrial readjustments, housing shortages, and direct inciting of racial unrest.

Herman H. Long, director of the Race Relations Department, the Social Science Department, and the Race Relations Department, cultivated their approach of research, education and action. The program grew into a complete process known as the Fisk Community Self-Survey in Race Relations. Ideally the Self-Survey, once started, would become a community affair lasting from 6 months to 2 years. The objective was to open the lines of communication between unfriendly segments of a community. This survey, and the success of it, was one of the high points of Johnson's career, for it required community commitment.

Before the Fisk team would involve itself in studying a community, two main requirements had to be met: (1) The team had to be invited by responsible, high authority individuals along with progressive minority leaders; and (2) an agreement would have to be made to make all of the findings of the survey public.

In 1946, Charles Johnson became the first black president of Fisk University. He had reached the pinnacle of a segregated society. This accomplishment underscored his marginality mainly because the presidency of African American colleges was not traditionally held by blacks. Johnson assembled an outstanding faculty and Fisk became a strong research center. It became the first predominantly black institution to meet Phi Beta Kappa's qualification criteria. His social science department in the field of race relations was among the best in the country. Yet, Johnson's personal role in the Department of Social Science, with the Fisk presidency, became greatly limited. Many were pleased, however, because colleagues and students who knew him agreed that classroom teaching was not his forte. He was just too busy with his many involvements. Very few students came to know him well in the undergraduate setting.

In the area of religion, Johnson moved away from the Baptist faith of his father. But he was active in the social action programs of the Congregational Christian Church. Marginal men have the tendency to move away from the traditional faith of their families. Generally, their moves are towards those faiths or religions that are more in line with members of the dominant group of similar educational background and status, or away from religion altogether. In the traditional Johnson style, he did not break away from Christianity but affiliated himself with a nonexpressive congregation, with a strong penchant toward social action. Even so, he kept himself on the periphery of that body, never becoming involved in the administration of the church itself.

Charles S. Johnson died October 27, 1956, at the age of 63. A bibliography compiled by the Fisk University Library (1947) lists 17 books of which he was either the author or co-author, 14 other books to which he contributed chapters, and more than 60 articles. His major sociological contribution was his personal demonstration that the emotional subject of race relations could be studied by sociologists from an objective and scientific perspective. His sociological studies covered a wide variety of black life, but he was always concerned with the depressed status of blacks in America and the implications of this status for the personality development of blacks and the impact on America's image of itself as a democratic society. Johnson thoroughly documented the reactions of blacks, of varying socioeconomic classes, to their racial status. Johnson developed the concept of the "folk Negro" as a social category which cut across class lines. Johnson was critical of the popular views of many social scientists, such as Park, that race relations in America constituted "a caste system."

Charles S. Johnson also affected the policy of the American Sociological Association, an organization whose annual meetings he attended for more than 30 years. In 1934, the ASA meeting was held in Atlantic City. Hotel management insisted that Johnson use the rear elevator when entering the hotel. Johnson refused, and the ASA established a new policy on convention sites. The policy mandated that the ASA would not hold its annual meetings at any establishment which discriminated against any of its members.

Charles S. Johnson was a marginal man who understood blacks as well as whites very well. This fact is probably best illustrated by Edwin R. Embree's account of one of Johnson's many experiences (1944):

> There was a good deal of trouble in getting ideas back and forth between the natives and the visitors. . . . Talking to an old man, [the visitors tried their] best to find simple words that would make sense to him. But he just looked blank. Then, seeing Doctor Johnson, his face lighted up and he called: "Mistuh Johnson, Mistuh Johnson! Come on over hyar and understand' 'em fer me."
>
> This was the highest tribute I ever heard paid to a sociologist. His job is to understand--and interpret--one person to another, one group of people to other groups. "Understandin' 'em fer us" is just what Doctor Johnson has spent his life doing--interpreting colored people to whites and white people to Negroes, Southerners to Northerners, rustics to city dwellers; analyzing people's problems so that they can understand themselves. (p. 40)

Charles S. Johnson was a marginal man who was generally able to keep his rage about segregation and racial injustice in check. Nevertheless, St. Clair Drake in the introduction of the paperback edition of Johnson's Growing Up In the Black Belt discusses the severe migraine headaches Johnson often endured whenever he attended the almost endless conferences on "interracial cooperation" (1967, p. xviii), a topic that appeared ludicrous to many blacks living in segregated, antiblack America.

Johnson became the first black president of the Southern Sociological Society in 1945, even though he (and other black participants) were not allowed meals or rooms at the convention hotel.

Cox, Du Bois, Frazier, and Johnson each had their own style, beliefs, and techniques, yet each was a dedicated and sincere scholar of race in America.

Basic Works

Charles S. Johnson became widely known for his research and endeavors in applied sociology. In the forties, he had established a well-circulated newsletter on race relations. His community self-survey of race relations was also very popular and the race relations conferences were held regularly at Fisk. That which has best stood the test of time is his published works. After his inauguration as president of Fisk University, the Fisk University Library compiled a bibliography of his works.

His basic works, those which have endured as masterful examples of meticulous research, are a testimony to his ability to marshal the facts. Johnson gathered empirical data and presented it without emotionalism. He used the survey method combined with the case study approach designed to show the negative implications of socioeconomic and racial injustices.

After the Chicago race riot of 1914, Johnson was named the associate executive director of the Chicago Commission on Race Relations. Out of this came the classic study, The Negro in Chicago: A Study of Race Relations and a Race Riot (1922), a very cautious and tempered book. But Johnson organized it with the basic theme that racial inferiority was a myth and that prejudice was learned, not instinctive.

An early key work of Johnson's was The Negro in American Civilization: A Study of Negro Life and Race Relations in the Light of Social Research (1930). This work stemmed from the National Interracial Conference held in Washington, D.C., in December, 1928. It was the result of 2 years and 16 organizations (such as the NAACP and the National Urban League) having begun a serious study of race relations. The culmination was the conference, and Johnson's task was to develop a sound basis for the planning of programs of improvement. The Negro in American Civilization was distinctly characteristic of Johnson, the marginal man, for he very dispassionately portrayed the stereotypes of biological inferiority, physical incapabilities and of mental limitations of blacks as erroneous. This book is filled with statistics, economics, and other demographic information, also characteristic of Johnson. He seemed to have a personal commitment to illustrate that a black man could meticulously use statistical procedures.

Johnson's most theoretical work was Race Relations: Adjustment of Whites and Negroes in the United States (1934), which he co-authored with Willis Duke Weatherford. Johnson's contributions to this book are an excellent example of his scholastic ability, especially his treatment of the Negro worker, and his analysis of the economic and social costs of discriminatory health care.

In much of his writings he makes a distinction between race and race relations, appearing to be a marginal man feeling the burden of entrapment by misconceptions. He encouraged his readers to understand the difference between race and race relations. Johnson noted (1934, p. 3) that "race is a biological term which has to do with physical characteristics based on blood relationship." Race Relations was a social-political-economic phenomenon which did not refer to biology. This problem in the past, as Johnson observed, was the continual attempt by many other writers to give race social and political meaning. Such theories he contended caused "conflict, arrogance, and persecution."

Race Relations: Adjustment of Whites and Negroes in the United States (1934) was written by Charles S. Johnson and Willis Duke Weatherford, a traditional white southern liberal scholar of the 1930s. Weatherford was a professor of applied anthropology at the YMCA Graduate School. The authors noted with pride that "no book in sociology had heretofore been undertaken by a white man and a Negro as joint authors" (Race Relations, 1934, p. viii). In many ways, it was two books in one. Each chapter was individually initiated. It is a curious work on several levels. Weatherford seemed to attempt some balance between an optimistic professionalism and his white southern heritage. He carefully describes the richness of African culture on the one hand and later bemoans the passing of life on the plantations. It is in this work where Johnson breaks with the tradition of his research works. In his research works he presented hard core analyses and statistical descriptions of the conditions of black

Americans in support of a need for structural change. However, in Race Relations he appeals to "the best element in the South" of the white community to engender attitudinal change. Johnson's chapters are of high scholarship, but his words are very cautious and noninflammatory. After all, Johnson was a marginal man who knew the white South very well. He was convinced that his findings would not be accepted if he attacked or criticized whites. Apparently his assumption was correct.

Patterns of Negro Segregation (1943) was Johnson's last scholarly book as a sociologist, and it reflects his interests changing. In this work, he looked at the rural South, the urban South, border areas, and the urban North. Johnson places his subjects in historical and sociological context and suggests how attitudes form opinions. Johnson then examines the various forms of segregation. First he writes of customs as "codes and rules of conduct" which become embedded in the conventions and the established racial etiquette. Second he deals with "attempts to regulate race contacts and relations by legislation." Third, he looked at the role of status in segregation. Johnson stressed the different kinds of spatial and symbolic segregation which had no relationship to actuality, but which were vital to his definition of status, forming an ideal type. Segregation was found inconsistent, in some cases more psychological than physical. Finally, he looked at the effects of segregation on blacks. Blacks became actors instead of objects being acted upon. Johnson (1943) gave an example in Patterns of Negro Segregation:

> . . . a shrewd Negro who ran through a red stop light . . . explained to the officer that he saw the white folks going through the green light and thought that the red light was for colored folks. (p. 284)

Many blacks, even some marginal ones such as Johnson himself, adopted, for different situations, some form of passive resistance.

Patterns of Negro Segregation describes the variations in the customary interracial practices from one locality to another. It defied the common assumption that segregational practices were uniformed and unilateral. Johnson develops a very meticulous sociological study of the geographical distinctions, secondary relationships, institutional practices, and public and personal racial etiquette. Additionally, Johnson examined the response of blacks to segregation. In his analysis of the development of segregation and discrimination in America, he does not simply attribute its development to slavery but explains the sociological dynamics and results.

He noted that the atomization of the culture and the social organization of the subjugated people permits temporarily free exploitation of its labor and other resources. Eventually, however, human and personal relations develop and nonrational network of interaction and interdependence. Johnson stated (1943),

> Political institutions, which follow economic penetration, seek to regulate the relations between the peoples of different cultural levels. This entire social structure derives its power and its prestige from the culture of the dominant race, which, in the meantime, supports its authority by rationalizing that its self-styled racial and cultural superiority afford natural and even divine rights of conquest and domination. (p. xv)

A mentality emerges which is then supported by ideology and beliefs, Johnson says,

> Thus, the philosophy of conquest, nurtured in self-interest and reinforced by the accomplishment of physical domination, becomes a vital part of the whole institutional structure supporting the relationships. Subject races may take over the standards, taboos, and other cultural elements of the dominant group, including even the concept of their own inferior status. (p. xv)

Johnson adds that such a state of affairs, however, cannot be maintained forever. He says,

> The process of acculturation will inevitably cause a disturbance of fixed racial roles; for the influences of penetrating economic, political, and religious forces cannot be isolated; nor can these elements of a dominant culture divorce themselves from others which are bound up in the web of personal relationships. There is no avenue of escape from the social and biological consequences of contact. Mixed-blood populations and culturally marginal peoples emerge. Adoption of the dominant culture standards and values produces new wants, new aspirations, and new ambitions among the subject peoples. (p. xvi)

The purpose of this work, Johnson explained, was to demonstrate the sociological aspects of patterns of racial segregation and discrimination in the United States, especially as it related to black Americans. Placing these issues in historical context, Johnson explained that democratic principle had not yet found full expression in America. Democracy was deflected, according to Johnson, during the post-Revolutionary War period by the rise of the planter "aristocracy." After the Civil War, capitalism could only be realized if the masses, who were not to share in the large economic benefits emanating from it, could be pacified. The solution was reached by providing the masses with "an illusion of superiority, in relation to a lower caste." thereby obscuring for a time the undemocratic tendencies of the total pattern. For Johnson, it was against this background of class and caste struggle (of a democracy defensive against the economic processes within its framework) that he studied and analyzed segregation and discrimination.

In the operationalization of his terms, Johnson defined segregation as a process of differentiation and distinction. "As a result of natural and social selection operating through free competition and conflict, an individual or group in time acquires a habitat, a function in the division of labor, and a position in the social order." Johnson indicated that by such characteristics individuals or groups are distinguished and set apart. Physical separation whether accomplished by force, sanctions, resisting unfamiliar ideas and customs, or for escape from ostracism and persecution achieve the same purpose, "that of the isolation of one group from the other."

Segregation, he explains, can exist without physical separation. This segregation may be self-imposed or imposed from without, but in the isolation it creates, the sense of social distance may be accentuated and reinforced by conceptions developed by each group regarding the other group. This isolation and social distance "inhibits communication which is basic to insight and understanding."

Social discrimination is the unequal treatment of equals, either by bestowal of favors or the imposition of burdens. Implicit in this term are ideas of arbitrariness, unfairness, and injustice. It involves the inclusion and exclusion of groups or individuals "by an infinite number of arbitrary lines of demarcation drawn on the basis of the most varied marks of similarity or dissimilarity." Differential treatment of individuals "based upon accepted differences in rank or status is the result of a similar process." Johnson emphasized the importance of this definition because of the conflict between the theory of democratic institutions which assume equality and the "sanctions in the mores supporting and justifying unequal treatment of theoretical equals. Johnson explained,

> Distinctions in law or custom, based solely upon race, which have the effect of imposing an unequal burden of restriction or other disadvantage are discriminatory and, to be understood, must be referred to the underlying schemes of social values prompting the distinctions. (p. xviii)

Patterns of Negro Segregation is divided into two main parts--Part I: Patterns of racial segregation and discrimination and Part II: Behavioral response of Negroes to segregation and discrimination. At the same time, Part I deals with three aspects of segregation and discrimination: (1) customs and rules of racial etiquette, (2) the attempts to regulate race contacts and relations by legislation, and (3) the definition of black status inherent in the racial orthodoxies, taboos, and stereotypes and the interpretations of personal experiences of white society in their relations to blacks.

Part II attempts to describe and interpret the behavioral responses of blacks to segregation and discrimination. It looks at individual behavior in a variety of interpersonal relations with whites. It also takes a look at some of the psychopathological phenomena resulting from efforts by blacks to make satisfactory adjustments.

Several chapters are devoted to the wide variety of customs and rules of racial etiquette in the North as well as in the South. For example, Johnson cites cases of blacks not being allowed to go to public libraries. In some cases, there were black branch libraries. These libraries, more often than not, had no access to reference books (p. 26). In a small town in Arkansas, it was reported that no provisions for blacks to check out books were made except if they were sent to the library by whites (p. 27). In some other places, blacks were not allowed to check out books at all. In these situations blacks would often have to rely upon sympathetic whites to check books out for them.

Johnson's depiction of the drugstore captures the complexity of segregational codes. He writes,

> The drugstore is a common meeting place for whites of both sexes, especially around the refreshment counter. Consequently, they have a different pattern of patronage from other stores. The use of the drugstore runs into the taboo against Negroes and whites eating and drinking together. Negroes are quickly waited upon so that they may go out quickly, and they may not get fountain or table service. They are sold ice cream, sandwiches or drinks, but they must be taken outside for consumption. There is usually no restriction on where they stand in the stores while waiting to be served, but instances were reported where zealous young clerks asked Negro patrons to stand at one end of the fountain while waiting to make their purchases. There were reports from small towns of instances in which Negroes could not even enter drugstores while white women were present. (1943) p. 71)

Johnson describes racial etiquette in various settings, including motion-picture theaters and the fact that wherever segregation existed, blacks had to sit in the balcony. Whites could also sit in the balcony if they desired to do so, but blacks were not allowed to sit in the main area of segregated theaters.

Patterns of Negro Segregation is a clear depiction of roles, status, mores, folkways, norms, and laws as the agencies of social control. It is also an attempt to illustrate the elaborate, illogical web developed for the subordination of blacks. It is an attempt to defy beliefs that segregation and discrimination were natural, mystical occurrences ordained by God. By citing case after case of disparity in customs, laws, and taboos, Johnson very cleverly and stealthly illustrates the contrived nature of Jim Crow.

Johnson also points out the evolution and significance of antidiscrimination legislation in the North, most of which had been challenged in the courts. He also discussed the fact that such laws were needed and that the reluctance of many individuals to change their customary practices, even to conform to the requirements of the law. In many cases, customs were so strong and firmly entrenched that even without specific laws, change was strongly resisted.

Part II of this book deals with the socio-psychological responses of blacks to segregation and discrimination. Johnson explores acceptance, avoidance, hostility, and aggression. The sociological approach to personality emphasizes the individual's conception of his/her role in society as the basic component of its organization and seeks to understand his/her behavior in terms of perceived roles in specific situations. Johnson, therefore, sought to explore the situational factors that condition an individuals' conception of his/her social role. Among other factors, Johnson took into consideration the community, class positions, family training (in regard to race relations), individual experiences (in race relations), age, and intelligence. In essence, he explained that his study of

Johnson found that the personalities of blacks were rarely altered by segregation and discrimination. An individual who was aggressive with other blacks was likely to be aggressive with whites. Individuals with seemingly identical racial, social, cultural, including common family backgrounds and training, demonstrated markedly different personalities.

This study is very meticulously done. An enormous amount of time and energy was invested in the collection of data and in the investigation of related studies. Johnson, throughout, however, does not include personal experiences or encounters with segregation and discrimination. He writes of the Southern Sociological Society's refusal to hold meetings in hotels in the cities of the South (which was made up primarily of northern social scientists) and of not holding dinner or luncheon meetings in hotels that did not permit interracial dining. Personal experiences, as a result of his numerous affiliations, were not included.

Growing Up in the Black Belt was an eight-county study of black youth in the South. For this study, Johnson combined questionnaires with open-ended interviews and personality profiles. This work focused on the impact of both economic crises and caste status on personality development in the black community. It shows black youth struggling with the ever-present racial system and the traditional socialization process of a complex society. Johnson explains that one lives a normal life with the usual "problems and tensions." Meanwhile, black youth cannot escape "the shadow of the white world" over his/her life (1941, p. 332).

Growing Up in the Black Belt was a "study of the personality development of southern rural Negro youth." Johnson sought the advice of a psychiatrist, Harry Stack Sullivan, and an educator from Fisk, Lilly E. Brunschwig, in the construction of an instrument to measure personality development.

The instrument consisted of a series of tests which were administered to over 2,000 black youths in the rural South during the mid-30s. The particular counties were Macon County, Alabama; Greene County, Georgia; Coahoma, Mississippi; Bolivar Mississippi; Johnston County, North Carolina; Davidson County, Tennessee; Shelby County, Tennessee; and Madison County, Alabama. After the tests, Johnson's team followed up with "intensive interviews of about 20% of these youth and, in addition 916 of the families of these youth were interviewed."

After collecting the data, Johnson sketched a personality profile of 10 respondents who were typical and had "problems common to the section." Then, he developed a presentation of the historical setting and the development of attitudes affecting their opinions. Johnson was most concerned about the opinions black youth had of themselves, their peers, parents, and the world in which they lived.

Johnson wrote about the social, economic, and religious institutions, customs, traditions, and mores within the black community.

Johnson discussed the impact of oppression from white society which made escape the "primary goal of individual activity." Escape was "sought in sex, and shouting religion by some; in physical flight from the country to the city and from South to North by many" (1940, p. 242). Johnson captured the high degree of confidence respondents exhibited with their "persistent and almost pathetic faith in education as the magic key to attainment of a better life."

He systematically dispelled a popular myth of the period, that blacks were happy with the status quo. Though blacks tended to display an ambivalence towards themselves, and other blacks, they also displayed a strong desire to escape from poverty and racism. Johnson uncovered a quiet struggle for dignity, respect, and status in employment and in intragroup relationships. Johnson made it clear that in the future blacks would not be willing to accept the caste system of the era. He wrote

> The Southern caste order makes the expression of antagonism inadvisable and even dangerous. Outward submissiveness and respect may thus be, as often as not, a mask behind which these youths conceal their true attitudes. In this situation voluntary withdrawal becomes the natural solution. (p. 296)

Johnson further noted that "in most cases the youth expressed themselves as preferring not to associate with whites, and viewed their segregation with indifference" (p. 288).

Johnson also observed that the qualities which whites found most appreciable in blacks (loyalty, uncomplaining industry, and patience) did not provide racial prestige in the minds of blacks. Yet, on the other hand, Johnson concluded,

> Among the youth of all areas, social classes, and individual temperaments, two characteristics were observed which were fairly common: (a) they were race conscious to the extent of recognizing themselves as different and apart from the rest of the community; (b) they entertained a conviction that Negroes, as a race, were treated unfairly and were suppressed economically. (1941, p. 285)

This particular marginal man was able to present the views of both sides about what gave blacks racial prestige, without bitterness or despair. He saw it as his obligation to explain whites to blacks as well as blacks to whites. Johnson insisted that all interviews be reported in the first person and that they follow the telling of their "own story" format. Looking from the periphery, with the best training, experience, and advice available, he produced this authentic work.

Reception

Charles S. Johnson would replace Booker T. Washington as the most influential African American of his era. Johnson could influence matters related to other blacks seeking financial support for social science research, academic recognition, and employment. Johnson had some clout with a number of private agencies, major foundations, and governmental agencies as well.

He had served as director of research and records of the Chicago Urban League and associate executive secretary of the Chicago Commission on Race Relations from 1919 to 1921. From 1921 to 1928 he lived in New York and served as director of research for the National Urban League. He was also editor of the Urban League's journal, Opportunity, from 1923 to 1928. From 1926 to 1928 he served as the research secretary of the National Interracial Conference, which was formed as the result of 16 national organizations coming together to form an organization to improve the relations between blacks and whites in society.

In 1928, he was chosen to serve as chairman of the social science department of Fisk University. Under his guidance, this department developed into a research center. In 1930, he was a member of the League of Nations commission to investigate forced labor in Liberia. President Hoover's special commission on black housing and home building was coordinated by Charles S. Johnson in 1931. Throughout President Franklin Roosevelt's era, Johnson served on several advisory and research teams for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Southern Commission on the Study of Lynching, and the Southern Regional Council.

In 1935, Robert E. Park retired from the University of Chicago and went to Fisk University to serve as a visiting professor. The presence of Park and Johnson drew many scholars to Fisk.

Charles Johnson was the president of the Southern Sociological Society in 1945. He attended the meetings of the American Sociological Association for more than 30 years. He was elected and served as vice president of that association for one term. Johnson served as an editor of the American Sociological Review in 1938, 1939, 1940, 1943, and 1944.

Johnson was a member of the first delegation to UNESCO in Paris and a member of the United States Commission for UNESCO. He served on many other commissions, advisory boards, and councils throughout his life. He received numerous awards and recognitions as well. He received the William E. Harmon gold medal for distinguished achievement among blacks in science for the year 1930. The University of Chicago Alumni Association cited him for distinguished public service in 1945. He was awarded honorary doctorate degrees by Virginia Union College (1928), Howard University (1941), Columbia University (1947), Harvard University (1948), and the University of Glasgow (1952).

Gunnar Myrdal, in the development of An American Dilemma, relied very heavily on Charles Johnson and his work at Fisk. Myrdal asked Johnson to develop a study of segregation for An American Dilemma. This study was published independently as Patterns of Negro Segregation.

In 1946, Charles S. Johnson became the president of Fisk University. This role removed him, to a large extent, from social science research. However, the reception of his research must also be explored.

Johnson made a conscious and meticulous effort to study race and race relations from an objective and scientific perspective. His The Negro in American Civilization (1930) was for quite some time the most commonly used textbook in American sociology classes on race relations.

Though commonly used, it was not without its critics. V. B. Phillips in the Yale Review (1931) scoffed,

> The pages are crowded and beclouded with statistics and summaries of answers to trivial questionnaires. And when rarely the author ventures a thought of his own, it usually proves banal. Somewhat more useful is an appendix containing certain lectures delivered at a national conference held in 1929. The notable items here are Thorsten Veblen's discrediting of the common statistics of Negro criminality and a repetition with fresh force by W. E. B. Du Bois of his well-known demands for full and effective Negro suffrage. (p. 202)

Johnson's works covered a wide variety of topics concerning black life, but they were ultimately aimed at revealing the comparative status of blacks in America and the implications of their status for black personality development and for the nation's image of itself as a democratic society.

In general, Johnson's major works fared extremely well. Critics applauded Shadow of the Plantation (1934) as having been done with "scientific thoroughness and accuracy," and as "intensely interesting in its human value." Collapse of Cotton Tenancy: Summary of Field Studies and Statistical Survey 1933-35 was described by one reviewer as "a competent, compact, readable introduction to a critical national agricultural problem." The Negro College Graduate (1938), Growing Up In the Black Belt (1943), Patterns of Negro Segregation (1943), Into The Main Stream (1947) each received very favorable reviews.

Of Growing Up In the Black Belt, the reviewer for Social Forces wrote,

> The entire study makes pleasant and refreshing reading. It provides an entertaining introduction to factual knowledge of how difficult and tedious a thing is childhood to a goodly part of the American populace. (p. 287)

The very nature of the review implies that feelings of sympathy, rather than outrage, were evoked by reading this book. It was not unusual for black and white scholars alike to write about the ills of the black community. Many black writers and scholars also wrote about the misdeeds of white racists--not Johnson. It was Johnson's basic style to present his findings without offending either side--whites or blacks. He was a marginal man who desired acceptance by both sides.

In Patterns of Negro Segregation (1943), his most critical attack of segregation, Johnson very skillfully points out how segregation undermines the principles of democracy. Alain Locke, in his review of this book for The American Journal of Sociology (July, 1943), notes,

> [This work] gains its unique value in comparison with other studies in this field not merely through its recency and an unimpeachable objectivity but also by correlating in illuminating fashion all the various phases of discrimination and segregation--legal, political, economic, educational, recreational, social and civil. Without overgeneralization and with due regard for local and regional variations, it becomes possible, in Professor Johnson's vitalized presentation, to diagnose these undemocratic social phenomena as general symptoms and thus to focus the analysis upon the underlying practical question of the general need for democratic consistency and constructive reform. (p. 95)

Unfortunately, Patterns of Negro Segregation did not fare as well in the American Sociological Review; at a time when Johnson was an assistant editor of this publication. Thomas C. McCormick (1943) wrote,

> The attempts to account for the forms of segregation and their sectional deviations are too broad and ritualistic to furnish the reader with much understanding. A main part of the author's purpose is to show a conflict between Negro segregation and the values of democracy, and his own attitude appears in adjectives here and there. Southern policemen are "rabid" and "vicious," a white relief administrator is a "farce," racial discriminations are "invidious," a refusal to admit a Negress to a southern hospital is "tragic." Certainly few readers will be able to follow through the descriptions and anecdotes of racial discrimination that are amassed in the book and will probably be more disturbed, however, by the author's final recommendation of mandatory governmental controls and regulations as the most effective means for breaking down customary economic and political segregation of Negroes in the United States. (p. 491)

Though Johnson's anger is well controlled, his frustrations were evident in this work. His push for government intervention was steady and consistent, but as a true marginal man, without force and without demands.

Conclusions

Charles S. Johnson of Bristol, Virginia, formed a close and lasting association with Robert E. Park while studying at the University of Chicago. From Park, Johnson developed objective scientific attitudes towards the study of race relations. Johnson also adopted, from his mentor, that in a European dominated world the impact of an African past was inconsequential to black Americans. Yet, Johnson felt that even if the continuity with historical Africa had been irreparably broken, blacks shared a bond with contemporary Africa and the Third World.

For Johnson, slavery appeared to be the most important singular historical factor in the relationship of blacks and whites in America. In fact, in his book entitled Race Relations Johnson wrote an entire chapter on "The Effect of Slavery on the Negro." Unfortunately, Johnson's interest in slavery was never integrated into his studies of the 20th century to give perspective and context to the situations he uncovered.

Johnson was a marginal man who spent his life trying to keep a balance between his roles. On the one hand, he wrote of the accomplishments of black Americans in the face of segregation. On the other hand, he often concluded with urgings for structural change in society. Johnson's work was well documented and complete with statistical data portraying his findings. Johnson seemed to have firmly believed that his advocacy was most effective through his intellectual pursuits. He believed that he could assist the cause (of black assimilation) by finding and presenting the facts. Perhaps as a result of marginality, he always sought to portray the comparative status of blacks in America and the implications of this status for personality development as well as for the image of America as a democratic society.

Johnson fully accepted the theory of his mentor, Robert E. Park, on race relations. Park theorized that race relations, in essence, moved through an historically determined cycle, moving from competition to conflict to accommodation, and then to assimilation. Park, however, was much more concerned with those aspects of the cycle moving from competition to accommodation. Johnson instead focused on the cycle's movement from conflict to assimilation. Park also believed in natural law and impersonal forces determining the direction of systems and group relationships. Johnson, much more than Park, believed that an individual could make a difference. He seemed to believe this was especially true if the individuals could maintain self-control.

His book The Negro in American Civilization (1930) was the most commonly used textbook (in the early 30s) in American sociology classes on race relations. It was replaced as the most commonly used by his work with W. D. Weatherford, Race Relations (1934).

In Race Relations he denounced Garvey and his movement. Perhaps Johnson was a marginal man who viewed Garveyism as a threat to assimilation. Even though Johnson could not bring himself to viciously attack white racism, or even white racists, by attacking Garvey's movement, he could vent his frustrations against all of the impediments to black assimilation into American society. By focusing on Garveyism, Johnson chose the safest, most nonresistant force. He received no repercussions for his hard words against Garvey. Had Johnson focused on the Ku Klux Klan or some other white-supremist group, this would have involved taking a risk. Charles S. Johnson was a marginal man not given to taking risk.

In one of his later works Johnson seems to give in to the order of the day, moving away from his focus on assimilation to focus on accommodation. Into the Main Stream: A Survey of Best Practices in Race Relations in the South (1947) was written by Johnson in collaboration with a host of associates. However, the introduction was written by him alone. In it he wrote,

> A new basis of accommodation must be reached; that both groups should cease to demand what is for the present impossible, but undertake together programs of action in those areas where there is agreement--programs which offer Negroes better facilities, more equal opportunities, and a fuller participation in the obligations and privileges of citizenship. (p. viii)

His book *The Negro in American Civilization* (1930) was the most commonly used textbook (in the early 30s) in American sociology classes on race relations. It was replaced as the most commonly used by his work with W. D. Weatherford, *Race Relations* (1934).

There was only one subject about which Johnson wrote that he allowed his emotionalism to run freely. The subject was Marcus Garvey, a black leader of a back-to-Africa movement. Every year from 1923 to 1938 (with the exception of 1927), Johnson wrote at least one, and sometimes more, vicious editorials about Garveyism in *Opportunity*. In *Race Relations* he denounced Garvey and his movement. Perhaps Johnson was a marginal man who viewed Garveyism as a threat to assimilation. Even though Johnson could not bring himself to viciously attack white racism, or even white racists, by attacking Garvey's movement, he could vent his frustrations against all of the impediments to black assimilation into American society. By focusing on Garveyism, Johnson chose the safest, most nonresistant force. He received no repercussions for his hard words against Garvey. Indeed, he gained points with more white Southerners even though some white racists backed Garvey's back-to-Africa idea.

CHAPTER V
EDWARD FRANKLIN FRAZIER

Biography

Edward Franklin Frazier (1894-1962) was born in Baltimore, Maryland, on September 24, 1894. He was one of five children of James Edward Frazier, a very race-conscious bank messenger. His father collected newspaper articles about discrimination against blacks and about individual black achievement in a notebook which he wrote on the cover: "From James Frazier to His Children." His mother, Mary Clark Frazier, had been born a slave. His paternal grandfather was a self-emancipated slave who had bought his family's freedom. Frazier was close to his parents and maintained very strong, clear memories of his father. His father died, however, when Frazier was 10 years old.

Because of Frazier's outstanding academic performance in the Baltimore High School, he received a scholarship that enabled him to attend Howard University beginning in 1912. There he studied the classical curriculum which included courses in language, literature, natural sciences, and social sciences. The languages he took were Latin, Greek, French, and German. He did not take any formal classes in sociology while at Howard, even though sociology courses had been offered there as early as 1903. But, a department of sociology did not officially get started at Howard until 1934. While at Howard, Frazier became a member of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society and served as president of the German and the Political Science Clubs, vice president of the NAACP, class critic, and president of his class in 1915. Frazier graduated cum laude in 1916. He left Howard with race consciousness and commitments to socialism and women's suffrage.

From Howard, Frazier went into teaching. He taught mathematics at Tuskegee (1916-17). Frazier began taking an intense interest in the problems of blacks around this time. He told friends that he became "militant" in his "opposition to the existing race relations and urged young Negroes to assume a militant attitude toward discrimination and oppression (1954, p. 234).

His interest in race relations and sociology (as the avenue by which to pursue his interest) became strong but were placed on hold until his military obligations were met. Even though he was "bitterly opposed to war," he registered for the draft in June 1917. Though he was drafted in 1917, he was not called to serve until the summer of 1918. It is highly likely that the fact that he was the sole supporter of his mother, his race, along with his college degree, all together, made it somewhat difficult for selective services, in the South, to determine what to do with this marginal man.

Meanwhile, his teaching career enabled him to be self-sufficient while the military decided what to do with him. He taught summer school at Fort Valley High and Industrial School in Georgia (1917), English and history at St. Paul's Normal and Industrial in Virginia (1917-1918), and math at Baltimore High School (1918). Finally, he completed his military service in 2-1/2 months (as a business secretary) at Camp Humphreys, Virginia. In September 1918, he was discharged.

Also in 1918, Frazier produced his first publication. It was an antiwar pamphlet (which he published himself), entitled God and War. It was a critique of war and religion, which Frazier called the two "nurses" of mankind that were initially necessary for the development of nation states and group morality.

> But now Man can dismiss the nurse, War, by abolishing international commercial competition and "Spheres of influence." The infidel no longer threatens Europe, and Africa was not made for European exploitation. (p. 7)

But, the most revealing element of this pamphlet was Frazier's analysis of organized religion. He wrote that religion had become "attempts of a magician to inspire fear. Allegiance to humanity is the true religion. A moral life is a life of activity in society." He went on to say that

> if people are to be moral they must be taught that evil and human suffering are the inexorable consequences of a bad act and that all the prayers in the world . . . and the reading of scripture cannot stop the operation of these laws. Penance cannot make the crooked back of the wage-slave

> straight nor can it give sight to the child born blind through ignorance of the parent. (p. 12)

At the end of the article, Frazier asked for the breaking of "sacred images" which

> keep the unlettered in superstition and exempt the educated from moral responsibilities. . . . Man is the only divinity we know and need to know. . . . He has eaten of the Tree of Knowledge and someday may eat of the Tree of Life. Earth will become his only heaven and exile his only hell. (p. 15)

It is one of the very rare written clues, by Frazier, of the fact that he was an atheist and would remain so throughout his life.

Still, his interest in race relations and in graduate study in sociology went unrequited for a time. Finally the opportunity came in 1919 when he was awarded a scholarship for graduate study at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts. He remained there for an academic year (1919-20). After Frazier's studies at Clark, he became a research fellow at the New York School of Social Work (1920-21). There he began a study of the black longshoremen of New York City. With the aid of a grant, this study was later completed and published in the Howard Review, under the title "A Negro Industrial Group." This study focused attention on southern migrants to New York City who experienced problems related to housing, their families, and their recreational lives. Their problems were heightened, according to Frazier, by their failure to understand the nature of union organization in the industry.

Frazier spent 1921-22 in Denmark as a fellow of the American Scandinavian Foundation. Frazier studied Denmark's folk high school and the school's role in the cooperative movement. After returning to the United States, Frazier taught sociology at Morehouse College in Atlanta.

In 1922, he married Marie Brown. She was a college graduate, a product of the black bourgeoisie of North Carolina. Growing up with servants in her home, she experienced a traditional "English" upbringing. Her father was an educator and Baptist leader; yet, she rather early began rebelling against many of the beliefs and traditions of her upbringing. She seemed to have shared many of the views of her husband, E. Franklin Frazier. Marie Frazier was light-skinned enough to pass for white. On an occasion when she and her husband traveled abroad, people asked them if she was considered a Negro because she was married to him. He responded, "No, she's a sociological Negro" (Boris, 1930, p. 111).

During his first year at Morehouse, Frazier helped establish the Atlanta School of Social Work and became its director. During this time, he began his writings on the black family. Here, before attending the University of Chicago, he wrote such works as "Three Scourges of the Negro Family" and "Is the Negro Family a Unique Sociological Unit?", "Some Aspects of Negro Business," "Durham: Capital of the Black Middle Class" and "The Pathology of Race Prejudice."

It must be noted that Frazier's first use of the term disorganization in reference to the black family occurred here, while he was in Atlanta. "The Three Scourges of the Negro Family" referred to in the title of that work were social disorganization, poverty, and sickness. In his article entitled "Is the Negro Family A Unique Sociological Unit?", he wrote (1927),

> The first fact that makes the Negro family the subject of special sociological study is the incomplete assimilation of western culture by the Negro masses. Generally, when two different cultures come into contact, each modifies the other. But in the case of the Negro in America it meant the total destruction of the African social heritage. Therefore in the case of the family group the Negro has not introduced new patterns of behavior, but has failed to conform to patterns about him. The degree of conformity is determined by educational and economic factors as well as by social isolation. (p. 166)

In the Pathology of Race Prejudice, he discussed the irrationality of prejudice and explored the dynamics which drove the prejudiced person. This article was not well received by the white community. Frazier's life was threatened, and he became the object of a manhunt. He quickly left Atlanta.

In all fairness to Frazier, it is important to mention that Frazier was going to leave Atlanta a short time later anyway, mainly because of an escalating clash he was experiencing with Helen Pendleton, a white social worker who was on the Board of Trustees of Atlanta schools. In Frazier's role as the school's sole executive officer, their conflicts were unabating. Meanwhile, Pendleton's clout with other members of the board grew increasingly stronger. Frazier fought hard to defend himself, but it was a losing battle. However, the threat of being lynched by a mob did hasten his departure.

In "Durham: Capital of the Black Middle Class" (1925), he hailed their puritan virtues of hard work, thrift, reverence for educational achievement and morality, demonstrated over more than a generation. Many of these virtues, according to Frazier, had been found among the free Negroes whose descendants took pride in their family heritage and traditions. However, the movement of blacks to cities provided the basis for marked economic distinctions within the Negro population. Segregated communities in these large urban areas provided support for a growing corps of Negro professionals, a small entrepreneurial group, and a substantial number of clerical and service workers who constituted the backbone of the Negro middle class. Frazier also noted that the new black middle class which developed with the massive migrations lacked many of the stable virtues of the older middle class, represented by free blacks, their descendants and the businessmen of Durham.

Frazier's article, "The Pathology of Race Prejudice," in The Forum, June, 1927, greatly angered the white community of

Atlanta. Frazier wrote about Southern whites who suffer from a "Negro-complex." Frazier explained (1927),

> Southern white people write and talk about the majesty of law, the sacredness of human rights, and the advantages of democracy--and the next moment defend mob violence, disfranchisement, and Jim Crow treatment of the Negro. White men and women who are otherwise kind and law abiding will indulge in the most revolting forms of cruelty towards black people. Thus the whole system of ideas respecting the Negro is dissociated from the normal personality and--what is more significant for our thesis--this latter system of ideas seems exempt from the control of the personality.
>
> These dissociated systems of ideas generally have a strong emotional component and are known as complexes. The Negro-complex . . . has the same intense emotional tone that characterizes insane complexes . . . just as in the insane, any pertinent stimulus may arouse the whole complex, so any idea connected with the Negro causes the whole Negro complex to be projected into consciousness. . . . How else than as the somnambulism of the insane and almost insane are we to account for the behavior of a member of a school board who jumps up and paces the floor, cursing and accusing Negroes, the instant the question of appropriating money for Negro schools is raised? Likewise, the Negro-complex obtrudes itself on all planes of thought. Health programs are slighted because it is argued that Negroes will increase; the selective draft is fought because the Negro will be armed; women's suffrage is fought because colored women will vote. . . . The complex itself is elaborated by ideas received from the social environment. (p. 857)

"The Pathology of Race Prejudice" was a significant work for it was a serious attempt to look at the purveyors of racial hatred by stripping away their illusion of being right just because of the pervasiveness of their thoughts and actions. It was an effort on the part of E. Franklin Frazier to focus attention on the villains instead of the victims, a bold and significant step for a black sociologist writing in the South in 1927. Frazier would retreat, however, not only from Atlanta (which was very wise) but from his study of white racists, white racism and the Negro-complex.

Frazier decided it was now time to pursue the Ph.D. degree in sociology at the University of Chicago. Frazier was strongly influenced by Robert E. Park, Ellsworth Faris, William F. Ogburn, and Ernest W. Burgess. While still a student, he became associated with the research program on the urban community and on race relations directed by Park and conducted by a group of young instructors and their best graduate students. This group included Louis Wirth, Everett C. Hughes, and Herbert Blumer. They basically believed that any social phenomenon may be understood within the context of the larger social system and that the larger social system may be coterminous with society.

Frazier served as a research fellow at the University of Chicago. As a research assistant, he occasionally analyzed the data on the Chicago community available in the department's research laboratory. Pondering the value of the data, Frazier wondered if the gradient patterns Burgess had discovered for the city of Chicago held true for Chicago's black community. Discovering that the information was transferable, Frazier made these views the subject of his doctoral dissertation. This work was later published as The Negro Family in Chicago (1932). Frazier (1964), explaining this work, stated that the hypotheses tested could be defined as

> Family disorganization among Negroes was an aspect of the selective and segregation process of the urban community. The ecological approach to this study provided an adequate test of this hypothesis. However, the frame of reference of the study was much broader. . . . The sociological problem is essentially the problem of social organization. (p. 416)

The Negro Family in Chicago led to Frazier's larger project, The Negro Family in the United States. He completed the research for this study while teaching at Fisk University, 1929-34, but it was not published until 1939.

Frazier became chairman of the Department of Sociology at Howard University in 1934. He served as director of the mayor's commission to investigate problems in Harlem, following the Harlem riot of 1935.

Throughout his years at Howard, Frazier participated in research projects supported by groups outside of the university. The Harlem Commission in 1935, the American Youth Commission in 1939, the Guggenheim Foundation in 1942, and UNESCO in 1951. Frazier undoubtedly was accepted by commissions and foundations because of the strength of his nonthreatening yet thorough research. It is likely that without the haunt of racism (over his shoulders), a black man willing to systematically explain the ills of black America could have witnessed unlimited possibilities.

From 1935 to 1943 he directed the School of Social Work at Howard University. In 1942 he was appointed resident fellow of the Library of Congress.

In 1939, Gunnar Myrdal hired him as a consultant for An American Dilemma. Originally, he was simply one of several scholars asked to comment on an initial research prospectus. Myrdal asked him also to submit a memorandum of the "Negro" family. However, since Frazier had already published The Negro Family in the United States, Myrdal decided Frazier's time could be better spent in other endeavors. So, Myrdal had a member of his staff to abstract Frazier's book for An American Dilemma. Meanwhile, he asked Frazier to write a paper on "Recreation and Amusement among American Negroes" and to summarize his "Stories of Experiences with Whites."

The stories ended up in the archives of the Schomburg Collection. One of those unpublished stories appears below. It reveals Frazier's Awareness of the contradiction presented by his marginality. Frazier wrote,

> This happened during the war when I was a youngster just out of college. A husky friend of mine, with whom I had played football, and I were walking down the street one day in Baltimore when we noticed an advertisement for educated men to join the Marine Corps. Knowing that Negroes were excluded from this branch of the military organization, I suggested to my friend that we go into the recruiting office and apply for admission to the Marine Corps. Since both of us were young and husky, we felt equal to any emergency which might arise. When we presented ourselves, the officer in charge, very condescendingly, but smilingly told us that we had made a mistake and that we should apply down the street where they were enlisting sailors. But I insisted with apparent naivete, that I did

> not want to join that branch of the service but that since we were educated, we wanted to join the Marine Corps. The officer in charge went on to explain that colored recruits were only accepted as mess boys and attendants in the Navy. He went on the explain: "Don't you see that if colored people were in the Marine Corps they would have to eat with white people." I replied, "O yes, I never thought of that, that would be terrible wouldn't it?" The main in charge seemed to be a little irritated but made no reply to my ironical remark. I turned away as if I were going to leave and then came back and said, "If I cannot become a full-fledged Marine, could I be taken on as a sub-marine?" The man became furious and blurted out inaudible remarks. I simply smiled and left with my friend. (Frazier papers, box 131-73, folder 13)

Frazier had been very active in professional sociological associations. He was a founder and later president of the District of Columbia Sociological Society (1943-1944) and president of the Eastern Sociological Society (1944-1945). In 1948, he was elected president of the American Sociological Society (now the American Sociological Association). Frazier, thereby, became the first black president of the American Sociological Association. This election marked the first time a black person had been elected to head a predominantly white national professional association in the United States of America.

Frazier published his classic work, The Negro in the United States, in 1949. In it, he combined sociological methodology with historiography. Louis Wirth noted in the introduction of this work that "Frazier had succeeded in depicting with clarity and understanding the adjustment of the Negro as a racial and cultural group to the life of the larger society and the response that society has made to its presence" (1949, p. vii).

Edward Franklin Frazier wrote his most controversial book while in Paris, Black Bourgeoisie (French ed., 1955; Amer. ed., 1957). It was controversial because many African Americans felt it to be an unfair scathing attack on particular elements of the society to which he belonged. What Frazier really tried to do was reflect the character and focuses of the black middle class. He pointed out what he saw as the depreciation of folk culture and a love-hate relationship with white society. This work was perhaps meant to be an indictment of the middle class in general, but the black middle class specifically. Frazier clearly attempted to expose the collaborative and oppressive role played by a black bourgeoisie that "has exploited the Negro masses as ruthlessly as have Whites" (1949, p. 236). In 1951-1953 he served as the director of the Division of Applied Social Sciences of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in Paris. Upon his return to his teaching positions, he wrote Race and Culture Contacts in the Modern World (1957b). This work was greatly motivated by his experiences at UNESCO:

> . . . the traditions and culture of people with different racial backgrounds shape their attitudes toward each other . . . the laws regulating the relations of people with divergent racial and cultural backgrounds are all determinants of the kind of group contacts and interpersonal relations which exist at any moment in history. (p. 32)

Frazier devoted most of his life to the world of academia. He understood the value of service organizations but held a higher respect for education and the dissemination of knowledge. Frazier also believed in integration, which meant to him equal opportunities and access to social mobility, but he did not believe blacks should lose their identity altogether. He was a socialist sympathizer and a marginal man who hoped for the development of an "international community." By that he meant "a world based upon federated cultures. A world in which imperialism and colonialism based on color would disappear."

E. Franklin Frazier displayed admirable courage when he insisted on proceeding with, and presiding over, a dinner in New York City to honor W. E. B. Du Bois on his 83rd birthday, February 23, 1951. The hotel where this affair was scheduled to be held canceled the reservation, planned speakers withdrew, and several guests declined their invitations. Du Bois had been indicted for activities as the unregistered agent of a foreign principal--the Soviet Union. The dinner was moved to a Harlem restaurant, and, as Du Bois wrote of the affair, "Franklin Frazier, the chairman, stood firm. He said the dinner must and would go on" (1968, p. 398). Perhaps E. Franklin Frazier was a marginal man who greatly admired Du Bois, even though, he did not always agree with him. But he appreciated the way Du Bois stood for civil rights for blacks, stood against anticommunists, and stood for polemical and intellectual discourse.

After retiring as Professor Emeritus of Sociology at Howard in 1959, he taught in Howard's Program of African Studies and at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies from 1937 to his death on May 17, 1962. During his life he had many opportunities to leave Howard University because of research projects, short-term visiting appointments, and lecture tours. For a marginal man, he seemed better accepted than most. However, he was never offered a full-time appointment at any major university in the country. He began and ended his career in the educational arena behind (what Du Bois called) the "plate glass" of segregation.

Basic Works

During his career E. Franklin Frazier published seven books, contributed chapters in several other works, and wrote 72 articles in professional journals. Throughout his life, his research and writing focused on the black family, business enterprises among blacks, the cooperative movement, and the role of social work in dealing with problems often experienced by large numbers of black Americans. This section is an effort to examine E. Franklin Frazier as a marginal man through his writings.

The three major works explored here are The Negro Family in the United States (1939), The Negro in the United States

(1949), and the Black Bourgeoisie: The Rise of a New Middle Class (1957a).

Frazier's doctoral dissertation was later published as The Negro Family in Chicago (1932). This led to The Negro Family in the United States (1939). The data for this study were collected before 1934, while he taught at Fisk. His new duties at Howard University would delay the writing and publication until 1939.

In The Negro Family in the United States, Frazier examines the natural history of the Negro family as it developed under a variety of conditions. Lacking a pattern to maintain (as a result of the slave trade disrupting the African background) and given the unusual conditions in America--slavery, post-Emancipation plantations and the mass migration to cities, North and South--different variations of black families emerged. Black families experienced structural changes. The results were behavioral patterns which sharply differed from the normative patterns of American families. These different patterns of black families included large percentages of illegitimate births, common-law marriages, female-headed households, higher incidences of desertions and divorces, poverty, crime, delinquency, and distortions in class identification and values. Frazier explained that these behavioral forms developed mainly from slavery, but continue because of the social isolation of the masses of blacks, the disorganizing influence of the city, the large-scale influx of black migrants into the urban center (while not being prepared for urban life), and the prejudice and discrimination of white America.

Frazier felt that the massive movement of rural families to urban centers during and after World War I produced personal and social disorganization on a grand scale. But he saw this initial response to the complexities of metropolitan areas as the first phase of a process that would eventually result in a reorganization of individual and family behavior as blacks adjusted to the demands of their new environment. Frazier had observed stable and conforming black family units based in part on the length of family residence in the city and on its socioeconomic status.

In The Negro Family in the United States, Frazier attempted to produce a balanced study of the black family. He provided sociological explanations for variations of black families from the normative patterns of American family behavior, thereby challenging the prevailing beliefs that blacks were defective, dependent, and delinquent, and genetically incapable of adjusting to American life. In his attempt to strike a balance, Frazier's work does include a look at stable, organized black families, though his emphasis is on the unstable, disorganized black families.

The Negro Family in the United States is an important work because it made large strides in setting the record straight in several respects. However, Frazier's marginality is still evident. His label of "disorganization" on these patterns of black family units which may have emerged for survival in the face of poverty but which were unpopular among the dominant culture suggests that Frazier saw these two cultures (at least at that stage) as contradictory and at odds until more black families adjusted to urban life and moved to more normative stages and patterns. Perhaps, in a more contemporary era, Frazier may have viewed the varying styles of black families as normative patterns for blacks living under overt racism, social denial, and economic oppression. He may have noted possible changes which the dominant culture would need make if substantive changes in black family units were to occur.

The Negro in the United States was first published in 1949. In it he integrates the stages of Park's cycle theory of race relations (contact, competition, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation) with the tough intellectualism of Du Bois and the facts of African American history. He dedicated this book to Du Bois and to the memory of Robert E. Park whom he called "two pioneers in the Scientific Study of the Negro." This work is a study of the emergence of black Americans as a "minority group."

Frazier strongly believed that the African past was of little significance to the culture of black America. In looking at the African background, he concluded that "African patterns of thought and behavior could survive only where the Negroes were isolated and where there was sufficient common understanding among them to give to African survivals" (p. 20). But Frazier noted the isolation "was always limited by the fact that the majority of the slaves were scattered over a vast territory on small farms and plantations." Most importantly, Frazier stated, was the "fact that the African family system, the chief means of cultural transmission, was destroyed" (1949, p. 20). This implies that Frazier felt that blacks were primarily American and little else.

The prime example of marginal men which Frazier analyzed (without referring to them as marginal men) were mulattoes. Frazier stated that in 1860 there were 90.9 males per 100 females among mulattoes, as compared with 101 males per 100 females among blacks, and in 1910 the sex ratio for mulattoes was 88.6 as against 101.8 for blacks. He accounts for this difference with the explanation that "the mulatto man has been more mobile than the woman and had more frequently passed into the white race" (p. 186). Frazier noted that this was particularly likely to occur because blacks were often denied employment, if it was clear that they were black. Marginal men had the tendency to blend in if they could (see Chapter I).

He analyzed the urban and the rural communities as they exist physically and economically. Frazier explores the development of various social institutions and smaller organizations which developed in the past; then, he demonstrated how they functioned at the time of his study. Frazier wrote of social and economic stratification, the black family, and social movements. He examined the intellectual life and leadership of the black community. He argued that attempts by blacks to find a desirable status in America was characterized by deliberately organizing to achieve common goals "by enlisting the participation and support of the Negro masses."

Robert E. Park collaborated with Ernest W. Burgess on urban studies. Burgess had developed a theory of the natural history of city growth and stabilization. His theory indicated that the city (Chicago) was laid out in five concentric zones. Each zone represented a spatial development of social and cultural forms, each outer zone representing an upward step for the people moving out from the core.

Frazier noticed similar spatial patterns in the black ghettos of Chicago and New York. In Chicago, Frazier finds at least seven zones. Families moving further and further away from the ghetto exhibit economic advancement, cultural assimilation, and racial mixing groups. In deference to Park who felt his race relations theory was infallible but often interfered with by obstacles, Frazier took the same approach in explaining variations in Park's race relations theory of contact, conflict accommodation, and assimilation. Frazier wrote,

> Although the five zones indicated the general tendency of the population to expand radially from the center of the community, the Negro population has not expanded to the same extent in all directions. It has been held in check until residential areas have deteriorated and therefore have become accessible. . . . In some instances white residential areas, even when surrounded by the expanding Negro population, have put up a long and stubborn resistance. This was the case with the area about Mount Morris Park. However, when this area lost its purely residential character and brown-stone fronts became rooming houses, the eventual entrance of the Negro was foreshadowed. (p. 341)

Of course, Frazier did not avoid analyzing the problems and issues plaguing the black community, as well. He wrote about issues concerning health, unemployment, crime, delinquency, mental deficiency, insanity, race prejudice, and "family disorganization." He asserts that because of the volume of the disorganization, the "Negro family has retarded the socialization of the Negro and lowered his economic efficiency" (p. 637).

The most significant factor in this book, however, appears in the 1957 revision because of a series of mind-boggling transitions in America. The focus of this chapter is the "Prospect for Integration of the Negro into American Society." Frazier writes of Autherine Lucy attempting to attend classes at the University of Alabama, a student strike at South Carolina State College for Negroes at Orangeburg, and the bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama, and serving as the backdrop of the changes occurring in America, and the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, which outlawed segregation in public education. Frazier noted, however, that the struggle for equality by American blacks could no longer be separated from the "struggle of the colored colonial peoples to attain freedom and equality in the modern world (1957b, pp. 703-704).

Frazier's marginality, however, becomes more apparent in his next major work, Black Bourgeoisie (1957a). Published in France in 1955, it was released in the United States in 1957. In this work Frazier notes that the history of the treatment of blacks and their negligible contribution as a middle-class group to the systems of production (implying that blacks were more consumers than producers) are interrelated factors which keep blacks on the fringe of society.

In the introduction of Black Bourgeoisie, E. Franklin Frazier describes the purpose of his study as making a sociological analysis of the behavior, attitudes, and values of the "black bourgeoisie," the two aspects of concern being (1) their existing economic condition and social status and (2) their standards of behavior and values. Frazier describes this arena as the "isolated social world" of this segment of the black population, which Frazier asserts came into existence as a result of racial discrimination and racial segregation. Frazier makes several other assertions, however, and a major set of assumptions which Frazier announced, are stated below:

> Lacking a cultural tradition and rejecting identification with the Negro masses on the one hand, and suffering from the contempt of the white world on the other, the black bourgeoisie has developed a deep-seated inferiority complex. In order to compensate for this feeling of inferiority, the black bourgeoisie has created in its isolation what might be described as a world of make-believe in which it attempts to escape the disdain of whites and fulfill its wish for status in American life. (pp. 24-25)

The assertion then is that the black bourgeoisie has considerable self-hatred, mainly, he says, because they are rejected by the white world, and also, he contends, because of their social isolation and lack of cultural tradition, the members of the black bourgeoisie "seem to be in the process of becoming NOBODY" (p. 26). This theory, however, Frazier does not clearly explain. The implication seems to be that because the social world to which the black bourgeoisie aspire is contrived by blacks themselves (based on their observations of white high society) is nothingness, therefore their success in this arena is the equivalent of becoming nobodies.

Frazier defined black bourgeoisie as consisting of "those Negroes who derive their incomes principally from the services which they render as white-collar workers" (p. 43). Their education was shaped by bourgeois ideals (p. 60); they wield no political power (p. 86); and they have no cultural roots in either the black or white world (p. 112). The black bourgeoisie exhibits, according to Frazier, a most striking inferiority complex. As a result of this, the single most important factor in the mental outlook of the black bourgeoisie is its obsession with the struggle for status, existing in a world of make-believe, that is typified by the activities of "Negro society." Of this aspect of the black community, he wrote,

> The activities of "society" serve to differentiate the black bourgeoisie from the masses of poorer Negroes and at the same time compensate for the exclusion of the black bourgeoisie from the larger white community. However, the behavior and standards of consumption which are maintained by "society" generally lack the economic base which such activities presuppose. "Society" thus provides one of the main escapes from the world of reality into a world of make-believe. (p. 195)

He explains that the black bourgeoisie is essentially an American phenomenon. Its emergence, he says, its rise to importance within the Negro community are closely tied with the economic and social changes in the American community.

Frazier states,

> Its behavior as well as its mentality is a reflection of American modes of behavior and American values. What may appear as distortions of American patterns of behavior and thought are due to the fact that the Negro lives on the margin of American society. The very existence of a separate Negro community with its own institutions within the heart of the American society is indicative of its quasi-pathological character, especially since the persistence of this separate community has been due to racial discrimination and oppression. (p. 211)

Frazier offers the black press as one of the most successful business enterprises owned and controlled by blacks but purports that it is the chief medium of communication which perpetuates the world of make-believe for the black bourgeoisie. But, he was particularly disturbed by what he described as a failure of blacks to become captains of industries and organizers of large financial undertakings as hoped by black leaders of the turn of the century. Frazier says that even though black business enterprises did not flourish, the myth of Negro business enterprise did. This social myth, he states, is a main element in the world of "make believe."

The black bourgeoisie, says Frazier, has no religion and no philosophical base. As a result, the black bourgeoisie, in general, but the "Negro society" more specifically, have become the worshippers of the God of Chance. They exhibit, notes Frazier, a preoccupation with gambling (including an illegal lotteries existing in American cities, known as the "numbers"), betting on horses, and, most especially, poker. He asserts that poker is not only the most important form of recreation for members of "society" but also the most absorbing interest.

In viewing education, Frazier states that the current teachers in black colleges have little interest in trying to "make men," but are more concerned with teaching as a source of income by which they are able to maintain middle-class standards and participation in "Negro society" (p. 81). The students, on the other hand, "as they ride to school with their automobiles . . . prefer to think of the money which they will earn as professional and business men" (p. 85).

Frazier also writes of the role of color, mulattoes experiencing special status because of their white ancestry. However, he noted that after World War I the significance of this factor greatly declined in favor of occupational status, mainly because of the status resulting from conspicuous consumption. Frazier insists that "among the black bourgeoisie an expensive automobile, a 'palatial' residence, and a yacht bring more recognition to a doctor than some achievement in medicine" (p. 128). In spite of Frazier's dismissal of mulattoes as the core of the black bourgeoisie, it is evident that mulattoes and other descendants of whites had held a special status during and after slavery. As a result, it was this group, without a cultural basis, that served as the roots of the bourgeoisie class described.

The black bourgeoisie, states Frazier, has a fear of competition with whites, as well as a fear of competence and first-rate performance within its own ranks. He explains it this way: "When a Negro is competent and insists upon first-rate work it appears to this class that he is trying to be a white man, or that he is insisting that Negroes measure up to white standards . . . in such cases claims that the black bourgeoisie slavishly accept the estimates which virtually any white man places upon them, but at the same time fear and reject white standards" (p. 217). He offers as an example of this the following note:

> When a group of Negro doctors were being shown the modern equipment and techniques of a white clinic, one of them remarked to a Negro professor in a medical school, "This is the white man's medicine, I never bother with it and still make $30,000 a year." Negroes who adopt the standards of the white world create among the black bourgeoisie feelings of insecurity and often become the object of both the envy and hatred of this class. (p. 218)

Frazier makes an original effort to analyze the black middle class; unfortunately, he relies too heavily on hearsay, magazine editorials, and unsupported, undocumented assertions. At the same time Frazier engages fully in ecological fallacies. He makes declarations about the actions, activities, and values of the black bourgeoisie and makes illogical psychological and sociological interpretations of what those actions, activities, and values really mean. For example, he does not show why he concluded that this group suffered from an inferiority complex.

Frazier also engages in historical validation. He indicates certain historical findings and uses them to account for current affairs. For example, he says that house servants during and after slavery only saw "the white man" in his home or when he was engaged in recreation. They, according to Frazier, never saw "the white man" engaged in the "serious matter of business." Therefore, as a consequence, "they devoted much time and much of their meager resources to attempting to carry on a form of 'social' life similar to the whites."

Perhaps the closest revelation of Frazier's feelings as a marginal man was given in this book in his explanation of the difference between the black bourgeoisie and poorer blacks whom he calls "Negro folk." He says,

> Except for the economic relations with whites, the Negro folk could retreat within their own world with its peculiar religious life, recreation, and family and sex life. Moreover, since the thinking of the Negro folk was not affected as that of the black bourgeoisie by the books and papers in which the Negro's inferiority was proclaimed, the black bourgeoisie suffered spiritually not only because they were affected by ideas concerning the Negro's inferiority, but perhaps even more because they had adopted the white man's values and patterns of behavior. Consequently, they developed an intense inferiority complex and because of this inferiority complex sought compensations. (pp. 146-147)

Frazier seems to suggest that black bourgeoisie, by virtue of their education which included large amounts of data purporting racial inferiority of blacks, could not help but foster an inferiority complex. This assertion may or may not be valid. But, he further explains, the problem is even greater than that, for this adoption of the "white man's" values translates for the black bourgeoisie into self-hatred. It is an assertion of labeling theory; however, that may or may not apply. There is no clear evidence that an inferiority complex automatically emerges, or self-hatred either. Perhaps there is something about a certain degree of affluence and leisure which lends itself to the pursuit of trivial, relatively unfulfilling matters. The lack of connection with traditional social institutions, even within the black community, could produce this feeling of emptiness that Frazier sensed.

On the other hand, it is highly possible that what Frazier described was something he, to some degree anyway, felt as a marginal man himself. It seems significant that Frazier first published this book in France, where he and his wife, Marie Brown Frazier, had lived for 2 years. It is also possible that because his wife was a "society person" herself, he drew from her feelings as well. It is possible that while living in Paris, she voiced a contrast in what she experienced there and what she experienced in the United States. There is no evidence of this, however, because E. Franklin Frazier does not leave an autobiography, and Marie Brown Frazier does not leave her memoirs.

Robert E. Park had exposed a Race-Relations Theory. This theory purported a cyclical theory race relations. The four phases of this theory are (1) Contact, (2) Conflict, (3) Accommodation, and (4) Assimilation. Park, for most of his life, believed this procedure was inevitable and, therefore, that assimilation was inevitable. Any delays in this process were attributed to the "doctrine of accidents." In other words, the race relations cycle could be interfered with by obstacles. Park held at least two other theories which had a profound impact on Frazier.

The black middle class, according to Frazier, lacked the strong entrepreneurial tradition of the white middle classes. Black businesses are small and mainly of the service variety--restaurants, beauty parlors, food stores, and funeral homes. The exceptions to these small businesses are the insurance companies and newspapers, but even these are small in comparison to those of the dominant culture. Even black banks are small in number and possess very limited capital. Because of discrimination and red-lining, it is very difficult for blacks to secure the types of loans and backers needed to launch such an effort on a large scale.

The black bourgeoisie is constituted of blacks who mainly derive their principal income from services rendered as white-collar workers. They are mainly professionals and clerical and sales personnel. Although their incomes are limited, they do not have the virtues generally identified with the middle class: industry, thrift, and belief in the substantive values of education. Instead, the black middle class emphasizes conspicuous consumption and an active social life--values, according to Frazier, more commonly associated with the white upper or leisure class. To Frazier the black middle class represented "status without substance." The black middle-class obsession with imitating the white upper-class values resulted in its deserting the masses. Frazier (1957a) wrote,

> When the opportunity has been present, the black bourgeoisie has exploited the Negro masses as

> ruthlessly as have whites. As the intellectual leaders in the Negro community, they have never dared think beyond a narrow opportunistic philosophy that provided a rationalization for its own advantages. Although the black bourgeoisie exercise considerable influence on the values of the Negroes, they do not occupy a dignified position in the Negro community. The masses regard the black bourgeoisie as simply those who have been "lucky in getting money which enables them to engage in conspicuous consumption." When this class pretends to represent the best manners or morals of the Negro, the masses regard such claim as hypocrisy. (p. 235)

Frazier believed that the frustrations and insecurities of the black middle class created a collective inferiority complex which in turn created a world of make-believe. The feelings of inferiority and frustration led to their delusions of make-believe centered on "Negro business" and "Negro society." Additionally, the black bourgeoisie, according to Frazier, failed to provide leadership for the black masses. Frazier criticized the black middle class for showing no interest in liberation.

Frazier's works set the stage for the analyses of blacks as disorganized, pathological, and superficial because of racism. At the same time, he presented the most thorough investigation of the black family, the black middle class, and race relations that had ever been conducted before. How well this marginal man was received by his profession will be explored in the next chapter.

Reception

The Negro Family in the United States continues to be a sociological classic and remains the single most important study of the African American family. In 1939 it won the Anisfield Award as the most significant contribution to race relations that year. However, Frazier did not discuss only the variations of black family life. Attention was also given to stable, conforming family units. Ernest Burgess' preface captured the contribution of the work best:

> All persons concerned with the Negro, whether engaged in research or involved in practical problems, will find this volume indispensable. It explodes completely, and it may be hoped once and for all, the popular misconceptions of the uniformity of behavior among Negroes. It shows dramatically the wide variations in conduct and in family life by social classes and the still wider differences between individuals in attitudes, interests, ideas and ideals. The first prerequisite in understanding the Negro, his family life and his problems is the recognition of the basic fact that the Negro in America is a cultural and only secondarily a biological group and that his culture with all of its variations is American and a product of his life in the United States. . . . An important contribution of this volume is that it provides Gestalt in which the problems of the Negro family, both for research and for practical action, take on new perspective and meaning. For this reason, if for no other, the work is both a necessary background and a starting point for further research upon the problems of the Negro family in America. (1939, pp. xvi-xvii)

Most of the criticism against The Negro Family in the United States came after Frazier's death, with the publication of Daniel Moynihan's Report on the Negro Family for the United States Labor Department, published in March 1965. Moynihan drew heavily upon Frazier's work for his publication. The citations from The Negro Family in the United States were numerous. Moynihan's work was viewed as an attack on the black family. Many black leaders saw it as a rationale for President Lyndon Johnson and others to shift focus from the key problems of the black community (which were unemployment, poor educational opportunities, poor housing, and limited voting rights) to the black family, which Moynihan described as a "tangle of pathology."

A key critic was Charles A Valentine, who stated that the Moynihan report contained very little more than an updated rehash of Frazier. Valentine, a social anthropologist, in his book Culture and Poverty: Critique and Counterproposals, proved to be Frazier's greatest critic. He stated that Frazier established a pejorative tradition by concluding that the black masses do not live by any coherent cultural patterns and that the "existence of the modern Negro poor is an immoral chaos brought about by the disintegration of the black folk culture under the impact of urbanization. Frazier's views of disorganization among blacks in cities, he maintained, was based upon four kinds of statistical data: "official Census data, statistical reports of social service agencies, records from the police and the courts, and case histories from social service agencies." Each of these sources has a built-in bias of its own. Frazier did not take that fact into account. Valentine asserted that Frazier's personal commitment to middle-class values and mainstream sociology served as blinders. Valentine (1968) insisted,

> An essential element in Frazier's reasoning is one that is perpetuated by later thinkers. This is a direct logical leap from social statistics, which are deviant in terms of middle class norms, to a

> model of disorder and instability. Such reasoning effectively eliminates consideration of possible cultural forms that, in spite of differing from Frazier's assumed standard, might have their own order and function. (p. 22)

Regardless of how Frazier and this work was viewed contemporarily, during his era, he was highly regarded by his field (see Chapter III). In the Bahr, Johnson, and Seitz study of the 10 leading sociological journals, Frazier was the most frequently referenced scholar concerned with race of the era between 1944-1968. In the article's list of works most frequently referenced in articles dealing with race and minority relations, _The Negro Family in the United States_ ranked ninth, while Frazier's _The Negro in the United States_ ranked eighth.

The Negro in the United States is a classic work. In it Frazier followed the lead of Robert Park in asserting that the origin and development of the American black subculture lies in the slavery era and in America, not Africa. He was primarily refuting the views of Melville T. Herkovitz. Herkovitz argued that much of black culture is a continuation of African culture. Frazier particularly disagreed with Herkovitz's contention that the black family structure and certain marital customs and sex practices are African in origin. Frazier argued that certain marital customs and sex practices are American in origin. Frazier conceded that the matricentric family is a holdover from Africa that was reinforced under slavery, while slavery prohibited the

African value of male dominance. Frazier insisted that blacks are an assimilation-oriented minority, since they have very little culture other than that of America. Black critics of this work took exception with this perspective that black Americans are without roots.

Supporters of Frazier's work felt that it strongly supported Park's views and applauded it from that perspective. It must be noted, however, that there was a strong difference between Park's conclusions and Frazier's. Park emphasized skin color and temperament as the major impediments to black inclusion into the mainstream. Frazier emphasized racial prejudice and discrimination as the blocks in the way.

Though Frazier agreed with many of the views held by mainstream sociology about the shortcomings of black life, he tried to emphasize that racism was the cause. As a result, several white critics agreed with his findings but felt that he overestimated the role of racism. As is often the case with marginal men, they seek to serve as the bridge between both cultures (see Chapter I). Sometimes this means maintaining one's marginal status, not really fitting in on either side.

Black Bourgeoisie: The Rise of a New Middle Class (1957a) was highly controversial for a couple of reasons. Some critics felt it was methodologically weak: The data on which it was based were not collected in an objective or systematic manner. This assessment appears accurate. Instead of being scientific, it was polemic. Additionally, Frazier's harsh indictment of the black middle class also met harsh criticism. Throughout most of his articles on blacks, Frazier maintained this theme that black values were distorted. He also repeated his belief that the racial system forced blacks to live in isolation and endowed them with a sense of dependency and inferiority.

It is interesting that Frazier saw causes of problems of the black community as being externally based, yet he in essence indicts the patients for not healing themselves. Without the existence of racism, black middle-class values and white middle-class values would be about the same. Frazier might then argue that the segment of the middle class which overly emphasizes the superficial have distorted values. Actually, he could have made this argument even in the face of racism. Instead, he observed that high values and virtue would move the black middle class into the fold. Perhaps an advantage of marginality, in Frazier's case, was that he could see historical and sociological issues surrounding the problems of the masses of blacks in the cities. Yet, he could not understand that for the most part neither the black bourgeoisie nor the black proletarians could, alone, do very much about the situation. What Frazier saw as nationalism among the black proletarians were the efforts of the downtrodden using any means revealed to them to be heard or to work together. Perhaps what Frazier described as distinguishable by class were elements more likely linked by knowledge (passed on by the more militant elements) of their history and the sociological implications of where they stood. E. Franklin Frazier's indictment of the black bourgeoisie for distorted values seems to be a position of a marginal man, frustrated by the continued reflection of the two main groups. His earlier indictment of Southern whites as suffering from "Negro-complex" almost cost him his life. His repeated indictment of the black bourgeoisie suffering from distorted values only caused controversy.

In the International Index to Periodicals (1915-1968), Frazier ranks highest of the four sociologists studied here. However, in the Social Science Index and the Social Science and Humanities Index, Frazier ranks second to Du Bois perhaps because of Du Bois' works in history, the humanities, as well as in sociology.

Among citations in race relations textbooks, Du Bois dominates from 1924 to 1965, but from 1965 to 1986, even though Du Bois remained strongly cited, Frazier had surpassed him (see page 21). In general sociology textbooks, Charles Johnson was the leader between 1924-1944; he was eclipsed by Frazier from 1945-1986 (see page 23).

One may argue that this means that the field of sociology appreciated Frazier's scholarship and commitment to presenting the facts. Others may argue that Frazier was as popular as he was because of his critical assessment of the black family culture. In his effort to show that the black community was diverse, often the negatives which he projected were what other scholars were looking for, perhaps as in the case of Moynihan, and those assessments are what enhanced his acceptance by his field--acceptance, however, as a marginal man.

Conclusions

Frazier, basically, was a critical scholar, a sociologist, a socialist sympathizer, an atheist, an individualist, a marginal man. Many blacks could not readily relate to him, believing him to be overly critical of black life. The government suspected him of being a Communist. Yet, he was consulted, cited, or selected by peers, researchers, and commissions. No major university would offer him a full-time position, but part-time assignments, speaking engagements, and visiting appointments were common. He strongly criticized the black bourgeoisie for being too superficial. Yet, his wife, who could have passed for white, grew up as a member of the black bourgeoisie and maintained the lifestyle of a middle-class housewife after they were married even though she was college educated and very interested in poetry. Often they traveled to Europe and attended high society (black) events.

In his profession, he methodically documented the variations that existed within the black community, highlighting those elements of the black life that he found positive and blasting those elements he found distasteful. Frazier was an American and generally decried those elements of the black community that ran contrary to the norms of American society. The one exception that he could not tolerate or accept was racism. He tried to address the myths perpetuated by man American sociologists as well as other white scholars that blacks were biologically inferior, immoral, and incapable of adjusting to American life.

He had friends who were members of the Communist Party. Personally, he supported them when he thought their stands were justifiable. He most certainly did not support them in all that they stood for and never joined the Communist Party. Frazier criticized them for catering to "black chauvinism" which to Frazier misled blacks into thinking there could be black autonomy. Even with his scathing criticism of the black bourgeoisie, he strongly believed in the values and ideals of the middle class.

Frazier, as many marginal men do (see Chapter I), tried his best to chart an independent course. As much as he admired Du Bois and stood up for him when so many others deserted him, he did not hesitate criticizing Du Bois when he disagreed with him, a clear example being Du Bois' support of black self-segregation. Frazier denounced this ideology surreptitiously.

Some of his critics felt that he overemphasized the impact of racism on blacks. Frazier from the beginning of his career to the end of his life tried to paint the picture of the devastating impact of racism on the black family, the black middle class, and on black intellectuals. He did not offer Communism as a solution to the issues and problems related to race relations.

The Negro Family in Chicago was characterized by Ernest W. Burgess as the first community investigation to combine effectively the case study method with the method of human ecology. Frazier was criticized by blacks for his use of certain terms such as "disorganization" and "pathological" to apply to what he determined as deviant forms of behavior in black families.

On the other hand, he was criticized for emphasizing racism as the cause of the pathologies in the black community. He believed that the black family should conform to the patterns traditional to white America. For this reason he was criticized by blacks as being too conservative. Marginal men often attempt to strike an objective balance between both sides. To what degree they succeed may also determine the degree to which they are accepted, by either side.

At the same time, Frazier continually dissected the activities and motivations of blacks but avoided pursuing this tactic in viewing whites. To have done so, however, may have eroded the degree of acceptance he did experience. Frazier, after all, did become the first black president of the American Sociological Association. This, by no means, was a small fete.

Frazier, perhaps as a result of his loyalty to his professor or as a result of his marginality, believed very strongly in assimilation. His sardonic critique of the black middle class is not intended to just serve as a criticism of the direction of the black middle class (as he saw it) but as an indictment of racial discrimination, which prohibited the assimilation of light-complexioned blacks and those in white-collar professions. It was also a criticism of conspicuous consumption and time-wasting activities of the leisure class.

Black Bourgeoisie serves as a venting of frustration at marginality. Park had asserted that the major obstacles to black assimilation were skin color and temperament (which caused blacks to be more inclined towards "expression rather than action"). Frazier believed that this segment of the black populace represented the greatest possibility of overcoming both obstacles. Many were descendants of mulattoes and were obviously of a temperament that allowed them to maintain white collar jobs. Yet, assimilation did not occur. What he interpreted as their becoming "nobody" was an indictment of the conspicuous consumption of the middle class and of what happens when the final phase of the cycle is thwarted. Frazier's work was an indictment of conspicuous consumption of the middle class.

It is important to mention that Frazier did show signs of growth and intellectual change during the latter part of his life. In Race and Culture Contacts in the Modern World, which was published after he had worked in Paris with an international team of scholars at UNESCO, Frazier examined racism from a global perspective. He envisioned an "international society" based on "federated culture" in a postimperialist world order where there is "racial and cultural differentiation without implications of superiority and inferiority." For early African American marginal men, growth meant within the context of race for, no matter what, the margin continued to exist.

CHAPTER VI
OLIVER CROMWELL COX

Biography

Oliver C. Cox was born August 25, 1901, in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad. He was one of six children born to parents of middle-class status, William and Mary Blake Cox. The Trinidad of his youth primarily operated as a crown colony of Great Britain to maintain and promote British economic ascendancy. Nevertheless, the British were in the minority on the small island. No clear-cut color lines were drawn. Class distinctions, rather than race, were much more of a source of difficulty for mulattoes (such as his father) and other light-skinned blacks in Trinidad.

Immigrating to the United States in 1919, Cox anticipated fulfilling his professional ambition of becoming a lawyer. In the United States he attended the YMCA High School in Chicago until he graduated in 1923. He received an Associate Degree in 1925 from the Lewis Institute. He then went on to study law and in 1928 received his B.S.L. degree from Northwestern University.

In 1929, Cox was stricken with poliomyelitis in both legs. Permanently physically disabled, he would need to use a wheelchair for the rest of his life. As a result, he reviewed his career goals and determined that he would not return to Trinidad to live and that becoming a lawyer was almost impossible. Not one to succumb easily to adversity, young Cox turned to economics as a career, a profession that would not require extensive standing or walking. He entered the Department of Economics at the University of Chicago in 1930.

Cox studied economics under such professors as John U. Nef, Frank H. Knight, Jacob Viner, and Harry A. Millis, experts in economic history, economic theory, and labor problems. Professor Frank Knight was renown as the translator of Max Weber's General Economic History. It is likely that Knight, as well as Weber's works, fostered Cox's appreciation of the comparative and historical approach and sociological perspectives. Cox does not give credit to any of his economic professor (or Weber) for influencing him, though. In the spring of 1932, he received the M.A. degree in economics. Yet, he continued to study economics through the fall of 1932. In the spring of 1933, he turned to sociology.

He was exposed to the ideas of Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess through their textbook, Introduction to the Study of Sociology, which was the basic text for introductory sociology at the University of Chicago at that time. Cox studied under such renown sociologists as William F. Ogburn, Herbert Blumer, Ellsworth Faris, Ernest Burgess, and Louis Wirth.

Cox acknowledged in his Ph.D. dissertation, entitled "Factors Affecting the Marital Status of Negroes in the United States," that he did look to the works of the two most prominent black sociologists of that era for insight while writing his dissertation. The two read were E. Franklin Frazier and Charles S. Johnson. Of their writings he wrote that E. Franklin Frazier's work on _The Negro Family in Chicago_ was an ecological study presenting crude data on Negro marriages. He then stated that the work of Charles S. Johnson, "The Present Status and Trends of the Negro Family" was "very much the same as Frazier's work" (1938, p. 11).

In the next paragraph, Cox (1938) expresses gratitude to William F. Ogburn. Cox seemed impressed with Ogburn's style, subject matter, and methodology. These were probably the same reasons why he chose to write his dissertation under Ogburn. Of him, Cox wrote,

> Of a different nature is the work of William F. Ogburn. His is by far the greatest contribution to the analysis of marriage statistics in the United States. The present writer has found considerable help in Groves and Ogburn, _American Marriage and Family Relationships_ and "Recent Changes in Marriage," by Ogburn. Although Professor Ogburn did not study Negro marriage specifically, his general work had been so thorough our obligations are too many to mention individually. (p. 11)

Cox received the Ph.D. degree in sociology from the University of Chicago in 1938.

Oliver C. Cox began his academic career as an economics professor at Wiley College, a small black institution in Marshall, Texas. In 1944 he began teaching at Tuskegee Institute. While teaching at Tuskegee, Cox's first and to date still most prominent work was published, Caste, Class and Race, by Doubleday Publishing Company in 1948. The book generated a great deal of controversy, mainly because Cox argued that racial antagonism in America could not be eliminated within this capitalist society. Only with the overthrow of capitalism could racial egalitarianism prevail, professed Cox.

His views on capitalism as the basis of racism did not fit very well with the Tuskegee machine. At the same time, even though Tuskegee Institute was a rather well-known black institution, his basic responsibility there was teaching economics. Additionally, most of the articles Cox published between 1944 and 1948 appeared in the Journal of Negro Education and probably did not reach the sociological audience he intended them to reach. Cox soon sought and received employment at another African-American institution, Lincoln University in Missouri, where he remained for over 20 years as a professor of sociology.

At Lincoln University his work was supported and encouraged, but he had no cadre of sociological peers with which to interact or debate. Cox basically worked in isolation with interaction mainly with the chairman of his department, R. Clyde Minor. Cox easily overshadowed Minor with his intellect, yet Minor was generally supportive of his endeavors. But, at a small black college with only two instructors in sociology, Cox's teaching load was heavy. Where practicable, he pursued his research interests even though his teaching suffered. Students complained that he was often boring and sometimes read verbatim from the book or would possibly spend an entire semester covering only two or three chapters of the textbook.

Cox often spoke on an intellectual level that many of his students did not understand. Having to live on the first floor of the freshman male dormitory did not aid his sociability with the students either. He often complained about their use of profanity and their lack of interest in educational endeavors. Relating to others was not Cox's strong suit.

To some extent, he rather enjoyed his isolation for it allowed him the time and freedom to study and write. These are things which he enjoyed the most.

Oliver Cox was not able to get around as much as he would have liked because of his paralysis from polio. But, according to Martin (unpublished Master's thesis (E. Martin, 1971)), Cox was a lifelong member of the American Sociological Association although he did not pursue any leadership role in the association.

During the last years of his life, Cox was invited to move to Detroit, Michigan, by a black sociologist by the name of Alvin Rose. Rose was the Chairman of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Wayne State University. Rose had been familiar with Cox for a very long time. He had arrived at the University of Chicago while Cox was there pursuing his Ph.D. Rose stated that he knew that Cox was the kind of serious scholar that he wanted as a part of his team at Wayne State. At the same time, he felt that Cox, at a small predominantly black college, did not have access to the kinds of resources, and intellectual and sociological stimulation that he would find at a larger financially solvent institution like Wayne State.* Rose hired him as a distinguished professor emeritus of sociology.

According to sociologists remaining in the department (in 1991), Cox never was exactly "just one of the guys." Marginal men often are unable to just blend in on either side of the plate glass. His marginal status was more evident in this environment. Though he had now joined a department with a team of sociologists, he often had difficulty finding colleagues interested in engaging him in intellectual debate over dinner. Alvin Rose (in an interview) clearly indicated how much Cox enjoyed lively discussions. But, even Alvin Rose left Wayne State (to teach at the University of Miami) 2 years after bringing Cox there. Cox, however, would remain at Wayne State from 1970 until his death on September 4, 1974.

---

*Interview with Alvin Rose, University of Miami Faculty Club, August 27, 1991.

Cox was undoubtedly a scholar and committed sociologist. He appreciated the methodology of Weber and the ideology of Marx. He was concerned about the economic structure of American society which fostered and maintained racism. He did not believe that equality could occur for blacks within a capitalist society. In the South, the white power structure had an economic stake in holding the masses of blacks as proletariats. In the North, even though industrialization created a need for an exploitable labor force, "the farther the progress of capitalism, the greater the relative power of the proletariat," stated Cox (1948, p. 570).

Black and white proletarians, especially in the North, where their proximity to one another was greater (because of the factories), would have to unite to overthrow the powerful white political class of the country through violent revolution. Cox (1948) stated that black leaders could not give blacks a "fighting" cause, going to far as to say that no black leader could:

> None can be a Moses, George Washington, or Toussaint L'Ouverture; he cannot even be a Mohandas Gandhi--a Lenin will have to be a white man. . . . Their success rests finally in their ability to maintain peace and friendship with whites; yet they must seem aggressive and uncompromising in their struggle for the rights of Negroes. (p. 572)

One could not logically expect the prediction of Martin Luther King, Jr., who would prove to be a black leader with the style of Gandhi and the determination of Lenin. However, a basic understanding of the marginal man, as leader, compromiser, interpreter, problem solver, should have led him to suspect that the leader of the struggle for black freedom would have to be a black man--a marginal man committed to the struggle for the equality and freedom of blacks and an end to racist customs, practices, systems, and institutions and, on the other hand, able to relate to those in power on a level they could understand.

He was fiercely opposed to black nationalism, perhaps because he had actually been a marginal man in Trinidad as well. In Trinidad he was the son of a successful mulatto. His uncle was a school teacher, and his eldest brother a medical doctor in the United States. Mulattoes and other light-skinned blacks in Trinidad expected a lot more for themselves than the dark-skinned blacks of Trinidad. As a result, perhaps he grew to strongly believe that race and color should be nonissues since they were regularly used as a tool of exploiting capitalists.

Basic Works

It must be noted that, of the four sociologists studied, Cox was unique in that he was born and raised in Trinidad. He was not exposed at an early age to the discrimination, segregation, and prejudices of the Southern United States. Cox was a black immigrant who readily identified with black America. As is often the case with marginal men of color living in segregated America, he felt compelled to understand and analyze the plight of black America. Cox was able to make comparisons between the quality of life for blacks in Trinidad and the quality of life for blacks in the United States. Hence, his writings reflected an intersocietal perspective on race relations. His perspectives focused on understanding what race relations were not. For example, he tediously illustrated that race relations were not caste relations. He also emphasized the key role of capitalism in the promotion and maintenance of racial antagonism.

In 1948, Caste, Class and Race was published by Doubleday Publishing Company. In 1959, Caste, Class and Race reappeared, published by Monthly Review Press. In the preface Cox states that he has respect for the "colossal intellectual output of Karl Marx." He also wrote that if parts of the study seemed Marxian, it is not because he has taken the ideas of this "justly famous writer [Marx] as gospel, but because [he has] not discovered any other that could explain the facts so consistently." In his prologue he outlines the state of race relations in America during the 1940s. The book is, as the title suggests, divided into three main parts.

Part I examines the nature and origins of the caste society of India. Caste is discussed in relation to religion, women, marriage, and occupation. Cox (1959) noted that a caste system constitutes a type of society; its cornerstone is social inequality. It "provides for the ordering of groups in society." Existing conditions become stereotyped and static, thereby maintaining a barrier against social movements of the revolutionary kind. However, "some movement is not only possible but also inevitable. Movement may be both individual or by the caste as a whole, vertically or laterally within the system. Individual mobility, however, is rarer and more difficult. Moreover, the social order is sacred and must not be questioned." Caste is to be distinguished from slavery. The latter implies "domination and force" which places "bondsmen outside the field of social competition . . . 'the slave is not a person.'" On the other hand, the caste member is a person consciously participating in an in-group with common expectations and reciprocal services.

Cox shows that caste is not a matter of "color" or "blood," but rather more nearly a cultural phenomenon. Accordingly, "pure-blood" theories for the origin of caste, racial antipathy and prejudice are unsatisfactory for explaining their existence mainly because the early literature on the emergence of castes in India is unclear and inconsistent as to "which skin color, if any, were preferable among the early Argo-Dravidians" (Cox, 1948, p. 95). This is one of Cox's crucial hypotheses and lays the basis for his arguments on class and race that followed.

Cox is particularly addressing the supporters of the caste theory of race relations in America: Robert E. Park, anthropologist Ruth Benedict, and W. Lloyd Warner. To Cox, caste barriers are never challenged: They are sacred. Cox could see that blacks were moving away from a condition of extreme white domination and subjection to one of normal citizenship. He asserted that, as opposed to caste groups, blacks have been culturally progressive from the end of the Civil War. Cox perhaps realized that if race relations were caste relations, no matter how self-assured he had arrived in America, his advances would have been minimal.

Part II of the book discusses class. It takes a look at some of the conventional systems of social stratification, social class, and social division. The conventional systems Cox examines are estates, social class systems, and political classes.

Estates, according to Cox, "may be correctly employed to mean status, degree of rank, position in the world, state, public property." But the meaning with which he was most concerned was "that of a social order or stratum of society" (p. 123). From a political stance Cox saw an estate as "one of the orders of a body politic, having expressed or implied legal claim to some degree of importance in the government. Cox went on to note that from the view of social structure, "an estate may be thought as one of the generally recognized social divisions of society, standing in relations to other divisions as socially superior or inferior" (p. 123).

Social classes, says Cox, "form a system of co-operating conceptual status entities" (1948, p. 154). A social-class system's most crucial characteristics, for Cox, was individualism. Individualism implies that different individuals have different attributes and that teach (it is assumed) person is free to develop, compete, and achieve advantageous social positions based on ability. "Freedom of the individual," says Cox, "means that he should be permitted, at least in theory, to make the greatest progress for himself and that this progress would rebound to the greatest good of society (p. 148).

Political classes do not constitute a system because, says Cox, "they are antagonistic" (1948, p. 154). The political class, as Cox defines it, "is a power group which tends to be organized for conflict; the social class is never organized." Political classes are generally "weighted with persons from a special sector of the social-status gradient, it may include persons from every position." It is conceivable to Cox that political classes will "split the social hierarchy vertically." Another unique feature of the political class is that it "seeks to attract members to itself, and group solidarity is highly valued."

Presuming a settled order, the ideal social order was static, Yet, even with a highly static philosophy and economic order, the estates never became castes mainly because of two reasons: First, the acquisition of the substance of status-property was tangible and acquirable, and, second, the most influential organ of the system, the priesthood, was celibate. Therefore, the priesthood was not hereditary. At the same time, Cox (1948) explained,

> the Church has a vested interest in the status quo and it will fight in the protection of this. Therefore, the social system cannot be changed radically unless the Church is either overthrown or forcibly brought into line with the movement. (pp. 171-172)

Cox strongly felt that the organized religion was not a private matter but a political matter. Therefore, the state, God, and society are generally linked in the minds of the people, and as a result, a blow to the state may inevitably involve a blow to either or both of the other two systems.

The French Revolution represented the removal of all intermediary political loyalties between the individual and estates. Cox states that this was the supreme organizational triumph of capitalism: the shattering of the social estates and the ascendance of individualism. The estates lost their wholeness, and the criteria of social status became diffused. Today the individual in cities especially has no estate; he belongs to a social-class system. "Social classes are not political classes, and a political class cannot become a political party. Political party factions tend to feel responsibility for the existing government" (1948, p. 199). A true proletarian movement, according to Cox, "never loses sight of the fact that it can never adopt the fundamental political assumptions of the government. It does not, moreover, expect the capitalist state to die merely of inanition.

Part III focuses mainly on race relations in the United States. Cox hypothesized that "racial exploitation and race prejudice developed among Europeans with the rise of capitalism and nationalism, and that because of the world-wide ramifications of capitalism, all racial antagonisms can be traced tote policies and attitudes of the leading capitalist people, the white people of Europe and North America" (1948, p. 322). He felt that "an understanding of modern race relations could only be achieved by looking at the methods of Europeans in their dealings with people of color." "In developing a theory of race relations in the South, one must look to the economic policies of the ruling classes." Economic exploitation being the foundation of racial antagonisms, Cox demonstrates that racial antagonisms arose concomitantly as a result of capitalism and nationalism. He explains the cycle of racial antagonism:

> First, a capitalist needs to exploit some people and their resources; then the more or less purposeful development among the masses, the public, of derogatory social attitudes toward that particular group or groups whose exploitation is desired--here the strategy of the capitalists will depend upon the nature of the ethnic situation; a consequent public estrangement of sympathetic feeling for and loss of social identification with the exploited group--that is to say, a development of race prejudice; the crystallization of a "we feeling" and of social solidarity on the part of

> the propagandized group against the exploited group and a reaction of the latter; and finally, the continual appeal to this "we feeling," consciousness of solidarity, or ethnocentrism as a means of intensifying race prejudice so that the exploitative purpose might be increasingly facilitated. (1948, p. 480)

Cox, in a footnote, adds,

> This, of course, is an ideal statement. Race prejudice is a continuing, becoming, changing phenomenon. It is directly responsive to changes in the whole capitalist system. Moreover, people of all races are born into and ordinarily accept the system as they find it. In modern times capitalists never have to begin from scratch and create the social situation in which race prejudice is developed. (1948, p. 480)

Caste, Class and Race was many years later followed by Cox's "trilogy" on capitalism. The three volumes were Foundations of Capitalism (1959), which is a "comprehensive work on the nature and evolution of capitalism as a socioeconomic system"; Capitalism and American Leadership (1962), in which Cox seeks to "identify the problems involved in the transformation of capitalism" as its leadership shifted from Venice before the 15th century to Amsterdam in the 17th century to England in the 19th century to the United States today; and Capitalism As A System (1964) which is Cox's attempt to "show that capitalism, as a system of societies, is characterized by a definable order and structure which not only differentiates it from other social systems, but also determines and limits interaction of persons within its reach."

A final work, Race Relations, was published posthumously in 1976. Cox promised in this work to provide a "distinct" theory of race relations, one "concerned with the universal manifestation of race relations and their functions, especially in the United States. Unfortunately, Cox died before being able to revise his manuscript. This task was taken on by the Wayne State University Press. As a result, the volume which was finally put to press included only a third of the original manuscript (Abraham, 1980). One is left to wonder about the remaining two-thirds of the manuscript which were "edited out."

Cox viewed the "clash" between the black and white worlds as a product of capitalism. He declared,

> All racial antagonisms can be traced to policies and attitudes of the leading capitalist people, the white people of Europe and North America. (1948, p. 322)

Cox believed that only the elimination of capitalism would enable the elimination of the processes of racism and discrimination, the process of racial antagonism.

Oliver C. Cox employed three key strategies in his writings. First he developed an in-depth historical overview of his subject matter, employing and giving credit to many great scholars, living and dead, from whom he was able to draw data for his historical analyses. Secondly, he made an extensive critique and analysis of each of the current theories and beliefs of the day concerning his subject. Generally, he was able to show the flaws and fallacies (as he saw them) of each of the predominant theories of the day. Thirdly, he presented what he found to be the facts of the matter. He presented his views systematically and with painstaking detail and elaboration.

Cox was a marginal man who sharply criticized the views of the giants in his and related fields. Then, he followed up by offering the dissolution of capitalism as the solution to the racial problems of America. This perspective left Cox open to tremendous criticism. Cox firmly believed that racism was endemic to capitalism. Race served as a symbol of demarcation, with people of color being clearly identified to be included among the exploited. The end of capitalism to him would mark the end of racism.

Additionally, his self-imposed isolation from his own race and his laborious penchant for detail probably made it easy for many others to simply ignore him. To what degree each of the above factors figured into his obscurity is unknown. Yet, because his books and articles were often controversial, he enjoyed regularly engaging in written rebuttals with other sociologists.

Reception

Caste, Class and Race caused quite a bit of tension in the sociological community. Even before it was published, it was assailed. Sociologist Howard Becker refused to write the introduction to it. Becker explained,

> After much soul-searching and a very pain-staking second perusal of your transcript, I am compelled

> to say that it will be absolutely impossible for me to write an introduction to your book which would not do more harm that good. Your Marxism is so undiluted, especially in the part on class and in the conclusion, that I should have to dissociate myself completely from these propositions. (Martin, 1971, p. 85)

Cox, however, would proceed undaunted. Eventually, the introduction was written by Joseph S. Roucek, who already was considered pro-Marxist.

The book reviews of Cox's works, especially _Caste, Class and Race_, were generally bitingly critical reviews. This perhaps could have been expected in Post-World-War II America. Everett C. Hughes, in a review of _Caste, Class, and Race_ written for _Phylon_, noted that,

> The author of this book has worked long and hard at it. He has many good and original ideas which he sometimes expressed in poetically powerful language. These qualities make the book more disappointing. For it is disappointing to find that an author of these qualities has obscured, where he claims to clarify, by the use of the utmost sophistry; that he turns his whole work by a colossal verbal twist into an argument _ad homines_; that he aggravates all of this by freely using without credit such of his opponents' ideas as he approves of, while he names them only for purpose of attack. (1948, p. 66)

Cox, however, was always quick to respond to Hughes' review of _Phylon_ and wrote,

> I am thankful to the editor of _Phylon_ for this opportunity to add a rejoinder to Professor Hughes' review of _Caste, Class and Race_. We should like to say in the beginning, however, that the editor does not have a review of the book. It seems that Dr. Hughes read Chapter 22, "The Modern Caste School of Race Relations," and, finding it positively opposed to his own views as a member of that school, decided it was sufficient to comment upon its

> content with scarcely a condescending glance at the other twenty-four chapters. (1948, pp. 171-172)

Cox enjoyed writing articles for journals. He also enjoyed responding to the debates and attacks his articles generally received. His last article to be published in _The Sociological Quarterly_ in the Spring of 1974, entitled "Jewish Self-Interest in Black Pluralism," evoked a wave of criticisms from the Jewish community. Unfortunately, Cox died on September 4, 1974, before having an opportunity to respond to his critics. Cox was a marginal man who enjoyed arousing the ire of America, not so much as a black man fighting the dictates of racism, but as a member of the disinherited fighting the waves of exploitation. He saw the struggle of black Americans on a different level, from a different perspective from his peers and others. These factors would figure prominently in his marginality.

In the field of sociology, Cox did not experience the prominence or acceptance of Johnson or Frazier. As indicated in Chapter II, in the Bahr, Johnson, and Seitz study of race and race relations references in 10 leading sociological journals between 1944 and 1968, Cox did not place among the top 28 most frequently cited researchers listed. However, in the study's list of works most frequently referenced in articles in the 10 journals, _Caste, Class and Race_ ranked 13th (see Chapter II).

In this researcher's investigation of the _International Index to Periodicals_ from 1915 to 1968, Cox was cited less often than any of the other sociologists studied in this work. This finding remained consistent throughout each of the sources reviewed, Social Science Citation Index and the Social Science and Humanities Index, from 1969 to 1987.

Table 2 (Chapter II) indicates that Cox was rarely cited in race relations textbooks as well, although many of these books dealt with the issues of caste and class also. Cox fared worst in general introductory sociology textbooks, as indicated in Table 3 (Chapter II).

It is likely that Cox's nontraditional perspective on the relationship between capitalism and racism, his strong sentiments against cultural and racial nationalism, and his methodical rejection of caste theories related to race made him an easy target for criticism and even easier to ignore.

Conclusions

Oliver Cromwell Cox attempted to clear away pervasive misconceptions existing in sociology and in society regarding race, for example, beliefs that race relations and caste relations were the same. The key differences were, first, that caste members tend to agree with the status differences which they believe they naturally find themselves in. Blacks and whites, on the other hand, generally disagree on the acceptable status of blacks. In the South, whites reinforced their beliefs that blacks should occupy an inferior status through lynching and other methods, while, according to Cox, the fundamental social force operating among blacks was social assimilation and amalgation.

The second key difference was that caste sentiment and interest tend to be "circumscribed and localized," while race sentiment and interest tend to be universal. Cox noted that if a "part of the membership of a caste were to migrate to some area beyond easy reach of the other, the likelihood is that it will become a new caste. Not so, however, with a race." Cox went further in explaining that "caste pride is based upon internal group invidiousness, while race pride cuts across caste lines and reaches out to a whole people, commanding their loyalty in a body" (1948, p. 428). Cox, the marginal man, felt a racial bond with black Americans that transcended his West Indian background. At the same time, he rejected any inferior status which whites projected to blacks and, on that foundation, rejected the caste thesis.

Cox was firmly convinced that racial hostilities and problems were the result of capitalism. He, therefore, further believed that the end of capitalism would mean the end of racism. Racism would no longer have a base for its existence. Cox believed that blacks should avoid efforts at nationalism which for him further divided the races and further impeded the decline of Capitalism. For Cox the key to the problems of blacks in America was the economic structure in which they lived. He did not see racism ever changing under Capitalism. But, he believed Capitalism would eventually crumble, and, when it did, he felt blacks should not be isolated and existing in their own little world but enmeshed in America as fully as possible so that under a socialist state they would be able to assimilate and advance like everyone else.

CHAPTER VII
IMPLICATIONS OF THIS ANALYSIS

This dissertation allowed for an exploratory analysis of the marginal man as a social type. The perimeters for this social type include movement of individuals or groups from one social milieu to another, without complete acceptance or approval of that movement by the old or new social group. As a social type, the marginal man may seek acceptance or mobility within the new social group while, through socialization/identification, brings along the old group.

Four early black sociologists were selected for this study of the marginal man because each of them searched for an answer to the causes and effects of differential treatment, based on race, while experiencing this form of treatment themselves. They were chosen because of their sociological methods or perspectives which tended to be representative of the methods and perspectives of other early black sociologists, most of whom emulated them.

The legalized segregation of the South, as well as the racism and discrimination throughout, may have initially appeared to each of them as additional barriers to the rites of passage into mainstream America. Instead, however, they found in varying positions, the existence of plate glass, beyond which, as marginal men, they could not tread. Each felt compelled to professionally and sociologically address the issues of race and race relations, perhaps in search of an answer to why differential treatment, based on race, persists even after all other criteria of equal or superior status have been met.

This study explored the lives, works, and receptions of each of the four pioneering, yet ignored, sociologists: W. E. B. Du Bois, Charles S. Johnson, E. Franklin Frazier, and Oliver C. Cox. When these four sociologists lived and began their careers in sociology, the overriding theme concerning race which pervaded the society was the belief that whites were superior to blacks.

Later, the focus of the race relations in America was buttressed on the race relations cycle purported by Robert E. Park, the thrust of which was the move of racial and ethnic groups towards assimilation into the mainstream, assimilation to the extent that any distinguishable differences would virtually disappear. However, Park and most other sociologists of the era did not believe that the assimilation of African Americans would occur any time soon. They key prohibiting factors, according to Park, was skin color.

During the 1930s, W. Lloyd Warner and Allison Davis developed and popularized a conceptual scheme for analyzing race relations in the South, which viewed black-white relations as organized by a color-caste system that shaped economic and political relations, family and kinship structures, and was reinforced by the legal system. Of course, with this scheme all whites existed in a separate caste above all blacks.

Today, sociologists include cultural pluralism as an important perspective by which race relations can be viewed. This ideology suggests an acceptance of differences of social groups in relatively personal matters but a commitment to the common good of the society of all.

However, in an earlier era when superiority versus inferiority, a drive towards assimilation, and the projection of a case system were the models which race relations were assessed, black sociologists responded. Early black sociologists personally attempted to set the record straight. Caught in the middle, they became marginal men.

Park's emphasis on complete assimilation and amalgamation as the final stages of his race relations cycle is no longer viewed as the ultimate goal. Meanwhile, the existence of a caste relationship between blacks and whites continues to be debated. However, even in a pluralist society which implies the positive acknowledgment of different groups, marginal men--more precisely, marginal individuals--continue to exist. It is a designation as Park stated of a superior, though sometimes superficial, intellectual type. . . . The marginal man usually had forced upon him the role of a cosmopolitan and a stranger."

"Inevitably he becomes the individual with the wider horizon, the keener intelligence, the more detached and rational viewpoint. The marginal man, according to Park, is always relatively the more civilized human being.

Park saw the paradox of the marginal man. On the one hand, he is personally (self) charged with the roles of leader, advocate, interpreter, and analyzer of his original social group. On the other hand, he admires, adopts, masters, and seeks to penetrate the inner sanctum of the dominant social group. Resistance abounds. Through the examination of the lives of the four African American sociologists studied, one could clearly see the role formal resistance played in the definition and maintenance of marginal status. At the same time, the marginal man's reactions, directions, and strategies are brought into clearer focus.

It is also evident, however, that had racism not played a prominent role in the establishment of the marginal status of the sociologists studied, their contributions may have been viewed quite differently. It is likely that their roles in the field of sociology would have been viewed quite differently. Even with the existence of racism very strong in the community, had it had little room in the discipline of sociology, as well as in academia in general, their receptions may have been quite different.

William E. B. Du Bois received a Ph.D. in 1895 in history. He took his degree in history since sociology was not an option at Harvard at the time. In 1899 he published The Philadelphia Negro: a social study. Drake and Cayton later hailed this work as the "first important sociological study of a Negro community in the United States (Drake & Cayton, 1945, p. 787), while E. Franklin Frazier mentioned that it was "the first attempt to study in a scientific spirit the problems of the Negro in American Life" (Frazier, 1957, p. 503).

Du Bois should be considered among the pioneers of American sociology. There is no question that without the interferences of race that Du Bois' The Philadelphia Negro would be considered alongside other classics of that era, such as W. I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki's The Polish Peasant in Europe and America (1927). Du Bois' work continues to represent a model for scientific and urban research.

Charles S. Johnson established and maintained the Fisk Race Relations Institute each summer for 13 years. Du Bois, a Fisk graduate, never addressed this institute. Even Frazier was not brought in as a sociologist to lecture at Fisk after many years of estrangement, perhaps out of a competition for the one coveted slot as the "most influential black sociologist." Both Johnson and Frazier were proteges of Park.

In 1941, Johnson became president of The Southern Sociological Society even though he and other African American participants could not obtain meals or rooms at the hotel where the convention was held. Nevertheless, Johnson gained control over the entire province of black sociology. Fundings from foundations for research available to black sociologists were channeled through Johnson and the "Fisk machine." This meant that the research had to be approved by, or at least not opposed to, by Johnson. Of the four studied, he probably benefitted the most from the racial myopia of the country. His close association with Park, Park's theories, as well as his commitment to cultural pluralism and assimilation gained him many friends and awards. Although he was quite knowledgeable as well about the white Southerner, he avoided that subject matter in his writings, as he avoided mt controversial positions. There is no doubt that he should be remembered in sociology for his empirical research and case studies of Southern communities. However, he paid for his stifled approach to racism and work with severe migraine headaches and, eventually, his life.

In 1948 E. Franklin Frazier became the first black president of a national professional association when he was elected president of the American Sociological Society (now the American Sociological Association). Frazier made significant contributions to the field of sociology through his research in race relations and his research in marriage and family; yet, he is also basically ignored today. Frazier's use of terms such as disorganization and his scathing attack of the black bourgeoisie caused controversy to regularly surround him. Yet, he constantly held racism responsible for the ills he uncovered in the black community.

He and Johnson agreed with their mentor, Robert E. Park, that the African heritage had little to do with the American black subculture. As a result, he championed the theory of blacks as a minority group developing mainly out of slavery.

Frazier, however, unlike Johnson, did write an article about white racists entitled "The Pathology of Race Prejudice." At the time, Frazier had already been forced to give up his position as director of the Atlanta School of Social Work (which he founded); yet, he was forced to leave town hurriedly, like a fugitive, once the article appeared in the June 1927 issue of the Forum and quickly appeared in the Atlanta press. He he not left town, it is likely that he would have been lynched. Frazier would never address this subject matter in his writings again.

Gunnar Myrdal relied very heavily on Frazier in the development and direction of An American Dilemma. However, Myrdal refused to follow Frazier's advice to drop the theories of a caste and class in the study of race relations in America. Nevertheless, Frazier is so heavily cited in this work that he had little choice but to define it once it was published, even though much of what he had actually prepared for inclusion in this work was omitted.

After his death, Frazier's work on the black family would be rehashed in Daniel P. Moynihan's report entitled, "The Negro Family: The Case for National Action." Moynihan gives credit to Frazier and quotes Frazier liberally throughout this report. Many of the theories of the black family's legacy being found in slavery, discrimination, urbanization, unemployment, and social disorganization are definitely reflected in Frazier's writings of the black family. However, Moynihan's conclusion that the black family was the root of the "tangle of pathology," which strangles the black inner-city communities, would become a very controversial issue associated not with Moynihan along but with Frazier as well, not because Frazier drew heavily upon Moynihan's writings but because Moynihan drew heavily on his, after his death.

Oliver C. Cox remained in the doctoral program at the University of Chicago for 7 years, partly because he would not withdraw from his radical Marxist ideology. Yet, his classic work on caste, class, and race remains a thorough historical and sociological investigation of those three subjects. Cox would be the only one of the four sociologists studied in this work to receive a full-time position at a predominantly white institution, Wayne State University. This occurred for this particular marginal man in large part because of the tenacity of the chairman of the Sociology and Anthropology Department of Wayne State at the time. The chairman of that department was a black sociologist by the name of Alvin Rose.

During the 1950s sociologists considered Cox a renowned Conflict Sociologist. In spite of that, he was, and continues to be, ignored by the discipline. Without the prevailing racial attitudes, it is likely that he would have been considered along with other conflict theorists of note, such as C. Wright Mills.

Marginality continues to exist as migration, immigration, discrimination, and racism continue to exist. Lines continue to be crossed. Though formal, legal barriers have been eliminated in America, race continues to figure into the equation. Leonard Beeghley (1978), in Social Stratification in America: A Critical Analysis of Theory and Research, stated that

> It can be shown that when blacks are assumed to have the same social attributes as whites (that is, the same regional distribution, on the same level of education, and so on, blacks still earn less. Sociologists argue that the difference between what blacks earn when they are assumed to have the same attributes as whites and what whites earn represents the economic effect of racism. (p. 249)

The American Sociological Association, in its August 1991 convention, placed the issues of race on the front burner. The Chronicle of Higher Education (1991), reporting on this event, quoted Professor Joe Feagin as stated that "there has been a general perception among white journalists and white social scientists that racism is all but gone--except for a few bigots, that's a cover-up" (p. A8). Yet, many white sociologists believe that race is no longer an issue while African American sociologists continue to hold supplemental meetings to the Association's to address issues particularly relevant to black America.

The basic thesis of the marginal man for his racial/ethnic group determines his response to the barriers. If one expects total assimilation, then he/she may look at structural impediments to that process. For example, Oliver C. Cox believed that only the total eroding of capitalism would allow for the elimination of racism and the development of assimilation. E. Franklin Frazier also maintained assimilation as the basic objective of the race. However, he looked internally at problems within the black community which he felt served as impediments to the assimilation process. At the end of his life, Frazier looked toward pluralism on a global level. In other words, the existence of a federation of different cultures, each of which would not be assessed on the basis of superiority and inferiority mainly because imperialism and colonialism based on color, would disappear.

Charles S. Johnson maintained a belief in pluralism with an acceptance of Park's theory on the inevitability of assimilation. However, in order for pluralism to exist successfully, it was necessary for myths and stereotypes about blacks to be eliminated through the production of sound research and well-documented facts, the challenge of which Johnson accepted. His belief in pluralism could be seen in his promotion of black writers, poets, and artists through Opportunity which he edited as director of the National Urban League. Also, it is evident in his interviews of rural blacks which he presented in the vernacular.

Du Bois' theoretical basis was nationalism; he moved far away from viewing assimilation as the ultimate goal for the race. Pluralism, equal rights, self-segregation, self-determination, Pan Africanism seemed more realistic direction for African Americans to take, at least as long as racism and discrimination continue to be deep-rooted, irrational, and pervasive in every facet of American life. Initially, Du Bois believed that a presentation of the facts about race, race relations, and blacks in America would erode racism. It was on the basis that he indicted historians, sociologists, and other researchers and scientists for not doing me to uncover and present the facts. Eventually, however, this marginal man became increasingly disillusioned and disappointed. Yet, to the end he sought to research and extol the virtues of African people. One may argue that marginal men with a theoretical stake in pluralism or assimilation should devote some time to analyzing impediments on the other side of the margin. Cox expressed his belief in the idea that black and white workers would have to see the similarities in their situations and unite. But, how this process was to occur was not made clear. Johnson, perhaps, understood rural whites just as well as he understood rural blacks. (This is evidenced by points made in some of his speeches.) Yet, he never wrote about them. Frazier felt, and wrote one article about his belief, that many white Southerners suffered from "Negrophobia." His life was threatened (by a mob) as a result of that article. Frazier never returned to the subject again. Du Bois initially believed that both whites and blacks needed to be reeducated in their beliefs about race and the role of blacks in America. However, once he reached the opinion that racism was too well entrenched in American society for education along to foster change, he moved away from analyzing or confronting racism.

Background also played a key role in their perspectives. Du Bois did not see the presence of racism provincially, but as an international problem. He saw himself as a member of a majority, that is, a part of people of color oppressed around the world. Du Bois of Massachusetts and Cox of Trinidad were born in environments where the racial hatred displayed towards blacks was not as harsh as in the South. As a result, both could see beyond the current reality of the South. What existed there was not all that could possibly exist.

Johnson was the only true Southerner of the four studied. He accepted the responsibility to research, analyze, interpret, and, in a positive way, reeducate America about rural black life. Frazier, born in the border state of Maryland, felt it his responsibility to critically assess the social fabric of the black community. As a result, he placed special emphasis on the structure and dynamics of the black family and the black middle class.

Both Johnson and Frazier were directly influenced by Robert Park. Both agreed with Park on the viability of assimilation. Their views diverged on the issue of racial self-respect. Johnson felt this could be achieved within the cultural life of the black community. Frazier strongly disagreed, arguing that racial self-respect could only be achieved with equality, and equality could only be achieved with the elimination of negative aspects of the black community. At the same time, however, Frazier contended that the cause of the problems and issues in the black community was racism.

Today, the trend has not changed; the interest in an examination of the maintenance of discrimination is virtually nonexistent. Some sociologists go so far as to say that racial discrimination is over. However, Joe Feagin in an article in the February 1991 issue of the American Sociological Review clearly indicates the continual existence of discrimination. Further investigation of discrimination, on the mainstream side of the margin, is warranted.

APPENDIX A
RACE RELATIONS TEXTBOOKS

Ashworth, Georgina. (1978). *World minorities*. Great Britain: Quartermain House.

Banto, Michael. (1967). *Race relations*. New York: Basic Books.

Banto, Michael. (1987). *Racial theories*. New York: Basic Books.

Baxter, Paul, & Samson, Basil. (1972). *Race and social difference*. New York: Penguin Books.

Bell, Wendell, & Freeman, Walter E. (1974). *Ethnicity and nation-building: Comparative, international, and historicalperspectives*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Berry, Brewton. (1951). *Race relations--The interaction of ethnic and racial groups*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Berry, Brewton. (1965). *Race and ethnic relations*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Blackwell, James E. (1975). *The black community diversity and unity*. New York: Dodd Mead & Company.

Blalock, Jr., Hubert M. (1967). *Toward a theory of minority-group relations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Blalock, Jr., Hubert M. (1982). *Race and ethnic relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Bloom, Leonard. (1971). *The social psychology of race relations*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Brink, William, & Harris, Louis. (1967). *Black and white*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Burns, Sir Alan. (1971). *Colour prejudice*. Westport, CT: Negro Universities Press.

Campbell, Ernest Q. (Ed.). (1972). Racial tensions and national identity. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Chametzky, Jules, & Kaplan, Sidney. (1971). Black and white American culture. Amherst, MA: The University of Masschusetts Press.

Crain, Robert, & Weisman, Carol Sacks. (1972). Discrimination, personality, and achievement. New York: Seminar Press.

Davie, Maurice R. (1947). Negroes in American society. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Davie, E. Roberts. (1954). The American negro's dilemma. New York: Philosophical Library.

Dean, John P., Rosen, Alex, & Johnson, Robert B. (1955). A manual of intergroup relations. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Edwards, Paul K. (1969). The southern urban negro as a consumer. New York: Negro Universities Press.

Embree, Edwin R. (1931). Brown America. New York: The Viking Press.

Embree, Edwin R. (1946). The story of a tenth of the nation. New York: The Viking Press.

Farley, Reynolds. (1984). Blacks and whites, narrowing the gap? Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Fisher, Sethard (Ed.). (1970). Power and the black community: A reader of racial subordination in the United States. New York: Random House.

Frazier, E. Franklin. (1957). Race and culture contacts in the modern world. New York: A. A. Knopf.

Gelfand, Donald E., & Lee, Russell D. (1973). Ethnics, conflicts and power, a cross-national perspective. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Giles, Howard. (1977). Language, ethnicity, and intergroup relations. New York: Academic Press.

Gordon, Milton. (1978). Human nature, class and ethnicity. New York: Oxford University Press.

Greenberg, Stanley B. (1980). Race and state in capitalist development. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Haselden, Kyle. (1964). The racial problem in Christian perspective. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Hercules, Frank. (1972). American society and black revolution. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc.

Himes, Joseph S. (1973). Racial conflict in American society. Columbus, OH: E. Merrill Pub. Co.

Hughes, Everett Cherrington, & Hughes, Helen MacGill. (1952). Racial and ethnic frontiers. New York: The Free Press.

Hughes, Helen MacGill. (1970). Racial and ethnic relations. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

John, Sir Rupert G. (1981). Racism and its elimination. New York: United Nations Institute for Training and Research.

Jones, Faustine. (1977). The changing moode in America eroding Commitment? Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

Jones, James M. (1972). Prejudice and racism. MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Jordan, Winthrop O. (1975). White over black. TN: Kingsport Press.

Knoft, Terry Ann. (1975). Rumors, race and riots. New Brunswick, NJ.

Kornweibel, Jr., Theodore. (1981). In search of the promised land. New York: National University Publication.

Kovel, Joel. (1970). White racism. New York: Pantheon.

Kuper, Leo. (19). Race, science and society. New York: Columbia University Press.

Landenburry, Thomas J., & McFeely, William S. (1971). The black man in the land of equality. New York: Hayden Books Press.

Landry, Bart. (1987). The new black middle class. Berkeley: University of California.

Levine, Robert A., & Campbell, Donald T. (1972). Ethnocentrism theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes and group behavior. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Lewis, Wyndham. (1929). Paleface: The philosophy of the melting pot. St. Clair Shores, MI: Scholary Press, Inc.

Lincoln, C. Eric. (1984). Race, religion and the continuing American dilemma. New York: Hill and Wang.

Little, Kenneth L. (1965). Race and society. Paris: United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Logan, Rayford W. (1954). The Betrayal of negro. New York: Collier and Macmillan.

Lynch, Hollis. (1975). The black urban condition. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.

Mason, Philip. (1970). Race relations. London: Oxford University Press.

Meier, August, & Rudwick, Elliot. (1969, 1974). The making of black America (Volumes I & II). New York: Antheneum.

Messner, Gerald. (1970). To be black in America. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc.

Moore, Jr., William. (1969). The vertical ghetto: Everyday life in an urban project. New York: Random House.

Newman, Jeremiah. (1968). Migration and integration. Baltimore: Helican.

Osborne, Richard H. (1971). The biological and social meaning of race. San Francisco.

Panetta, Leon E., & Gall, Peter. (1971). Bring us together. Philadelphia: Lippincott Co.

Park, Robert E. (1950). Race and culture. New York: The Free Press.

Parris, Guichard, & Brooks, Lester. (1971). Blacks in the city. Boston: Little Brown and Co.

Rabushka, Alvin. (1974). A theory of racial harmony. South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press.

Reardon, Betty. (1977). Discrimination. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Record, Wilson. (1951). The negro and the communist party. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Record, Wilson. (1964). Race and radicalism. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Reich, Michael. (1981). Racial inequality. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rex, John. (1970). Race relations in sociological theory. New York: Shocken Books.

Rose, Peter I. (1968). The subject is race: Traditional ideologies and the teaching of race relations. New York: Oxford Press.

Ross, Jack C., & Wheeler, Raymond H. (1971). Black belonging. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Co.

Scanzoni, John H. (1977). The black family in modern society: Patterns of stability and security. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Schermerhorn, R. A. (1970). Comparative ethnic relations. New York: Random House.

Schultz, Davis A. (1969). Coming up black patterns of ghetto socialization. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Segal, Ronald. (1967). The race war. New York: The Viking Press.

Simpson, George E., & Yinger, Milton J. (1953). Racial and cultural minorities: An analysis of prejudice and discrimination. New York: Harper & Row.

Sowell, Thomas. (1983). The economics and politics of race. New York: William Morrow and Co.

Speer, Robert E. (1924). Race and race relations: A Christian view of human contacts. New York: Negro Universities Press.

Spiller, G. (1970). Inter-racial problems: Papers from the First Universl Races Congress held in London in 1911. New York: The Citadel Press.

Stack, Carol. (1974). All our kin strategies for survival in a black community. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Steinberg, Stephen. (1981). The ethnic myth race, ethnicity and class in America. Boston: Beacon Press.

Stoddard, Lothrop. (1971). The rising tide of color against white-world supremacy. Westport, CT: Negro Universities Press.

Stone, John. (1985). Racial conflict in contemporary society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tinker, Hugh. (1977). Race conflict and the international order. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Van de Berghe, Pierre L. (1967). Race and racism. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Washington, Jr., Joseph R. (1969). Black & white. Boston: Beacon Press.

Weatherford, Willis, and Johnson, Charles S. (1934). Race relations: Adjustment of whites and negroes in the United States. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company.

Wilhelm, Sidney. (1970). Who needs the negro. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing Co., Inc.

Williams, Jr., Robin M. (1945). The reduction of intergroup tensions. New York: Social Research Council.

Wilson, William Julius. (1980). The declining significance of race. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Yin, Robert K. (1973). Race, creed, color, or national origin. Ithasca, IL: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.

Zubaida, Sami. (1970). Race and racialism. London: Taristock Publications.

APPENDIX B
GENERAL SOCIOLOGY TEXTBOOKS

Almquist, Elizabeth M., Chafetz, Janet S., Chance, Barbara J., & Corder-Bolz, Judy. (1978). Sociology: Women, men, and society. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Co.

Aubert, Vilhelm. (1967). Elements of sociology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Baldridge, J. Victor. (1975). Sociology: A critical approach to power, conflict, and change. New York: John Wiley & Sons Co.

Baums, Gregory. (1980). Sociology and human destiny. New York: Seabury Press.

Beach, Walter G., & Ogburn, William F. (1925, 1937). An introduction to sociology and social problems. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Becker, Howard, Gillen, John, Hallowell, Irving A., Murdock, George Peter, Newcomb, Theodore, Parsons, Talcott, & Smith, Brewster. (1954). For a science of social man. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Bennett, John W., & Tumin, Melvin M. (1952). Social life structure and function. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Berger, Peter S. (1963). Invitation to sociology. New York: Anchor Books.

Bernard, Jessie, & Jensen, Deborah M. (1958). Sociology. St. Louis: The C. V. Mosley Co.

Bierstedt, Robert. (1981). American sociological theory: A critical history. New York: Academic Press.

Blackmar, Frank W., & Gillin, John Lewis. (1916, 1936). Outlines of sociology. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Biedemerer, Harry C., & Stephenson, Richard. (1962). The analysis of social systems. San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston Press.

Bierstedt, Robert. (1957). The social order. New York: New York City College.

Biesany, John, & Biesany, Morris H. (1969, 1973). Introduction to sociology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Press.

Bogardus, Emory S. (1932). Contemporary sociology. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.

Bogardus, Emory S. (1935). Sociology. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Broom, Leonard, & Selznick, Philip. (1970, 1973). Sociology: A text with adapted readings. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Bryant, Christoper G. A. (1976). Sociology in action. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bottomore, Tom. (1962, 1971, 1987). Sociology: A guide to problems and literature. Boston: Allen and Unwin.

Carey, James T. (1975). Sociology and public affairs. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Case, Clarence M. (1924). Outlines of introductory sociology. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.

Chinoy, E. (1962). Society. New York: Random House.

Cooley, Charles HOrton, Angell, Robert C., & Carr, Lowell J. (1933). Introductory sociology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Coulson, Margaret A., & Riddell, Carol. (1980). Approaching sociology. Boston: Paul Routledge and Kegan.

Cuber, John F. (1947, 1955, 1968). Sociology: A synopsis of principles. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

Davis, Jerome, & Barnes, Elmer. (1931). An introduction to sociology. Boston: Heath Co.

Davis, Kingsley. (1949). Human society. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Dawson, Carl A., & Getty, Warner E. (1935, 1948). An introduction to sociology. New York: The Ronald Press Co.

Defleur, L. Melvin, D'Antoneo, William V., & Defleur, Lois. (1971). Sociology man in society. IL: Scott Foresman & Co.

De Grange, McQuilkin. (1973). The nature and elements of sociology. New York: Yale University Press.

Denisoff, R. Serge, & Wahrman, Ralph. (1979). Introduction to sociology. New York: Macmillan Publishg Co., Inc.

Douglas, Jack D. (1973). Introduction to sociology situations and structures. New York: The Free Press.

Dow, Grove, & Dow, Samuel. (1937). Society and its problems and introduction to the principles of sociology. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.

Duncan, Hannibal G. (1931). Background for sociology. Boston: Marshall Jones Co.

Dressler, David. (1969). Sociology: The study of human interaction. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Ellwood, Charles A. (1924). Sociology and modern social problems. New York: American Book Co.

Elmer, Manuel C. (1939). Social research. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Eshleman, J. Ross, & Cashion, Barbara G. (1983). Sociology: An introduction. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Eubank, Earle E. (1932). The concepts of sociology. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co.

Faris, Robert E. L. (1964). Handbook of modern sociology. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Feigelman, William. (1972). Sociology full circle. New York: Prager.

Fernandez, Ronald, & Barile Leo, with Evan, Linda, & Ertel, Mary. (1975, 1979). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Fichter, Joseph. (1957, 1958). Sociology socio-socio. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Floro, George K. (1986). *Sociology for life*. New York: University Press of Aucer.

Freedman, Ronald, Hawley, Amos H., Landecker, Werner S., & Miner, Horace M. (1952). *Principles of sociology*. New York: Henry Holt & Co.

Furfey, Paul Hanly. (1953). *The scope and methods of sociology*. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

Gidden, Anthony, & Turner, J. H. (1987). *Sociology today*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gillin, John Lewis, & Gillin, John Philip. (1944). *An introduction to sociology*. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Ginsberg, Morris. (1949). *Sociology*. London: Oxford University Press.

Gittler, Joseph B. (Ed.). (1957). *Review of sociology*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Goldthorpe, J. E. (1968). *An introduction to sociology*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Goodman, Norman, & Marx, Gary T. (1971, 1973, 1978, 1982). *Society today*. New York: Random House.

Gouldner, Alvin W., & Gouldner, Helen P. (1963). *Modern sociology: An introduction to the study of human interaction*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.

Green, Arnold W. (1968). *Sociology: An analysis of life in modern society*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Groves, Ernest R. (1973). *An introduction to sociology*. New York: Paine Whiteman Publishers.

Gumplowicz, Ludwig. (1973). *Outlines in sociology*. New York: Paine Whiteman Publishers.

Gurvitch, George, & Wilbert, E. (1945). *Twentieth century sociology*. New York: The Philosophical Library.

Hammond, Phillip E., Goodman, Louis W., Greer, Scott, Hall, Ricahrd, & Taylor, Mary C. (1975). *The structure of human society*. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Co.

Hankins, Frank H. (1929). *An introduction to the study of society*. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Hess, Beth B., Markson, Elizabeth W., & Stein, Peter J. (1985). Sociology. New York: The Macmillan Publishing Co.

Hiller, E. T. (1933). Principles of sociology. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

Himes, Joseph S. (1968). The study of sociology: An introductin. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman & Co.

Horton, Paul B., & Hunt, Chester L. (1964, 1968, 1972, 1980). Sociology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Inkeles, Alex. (1964). What is sociology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Jensen, Deborah. (1947). Sociology and social problems. St. Louis: The C. V. Mosby Co.

Kuhn, Alfred. (1963). The study of society. IL: The Doresey Press.

Landberg, George A., Schrag, Clarence, & Larson, Otto N. (1954, 1958, 1963). Sociology. New York: Harper & Row.

Landis, Paul H. (1958). Introductory sociology. New York: The Ronald Press Co.

Lapiere, Richard D. (1946). Sociology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Lee, Alfred M. (1953). Principles of sociology. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc.

Leslie, Gerald R., Larson, Richard F., & Gorman, Benjamin L. (1976). Introductory sociology. New York: Oxford University Press.

Light, Jr., Donald, & Keller, Suzanne. (1975). Sociology. New York: Alfred A. KNopf.

Lowry, Ritchie P., & Rankin, Robert. (1969). Sociology: The science of society. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Lundberg, George A., Schrage, Clarence, Larson, Otton N., & Carlton, Jr., William R. (1954, 1958, 1965, 1968). Sociology. New York: Harper & Row.

Lundberg, George A., Schrage, Clarence, Larson, Otton N., & Carlton, Jr., William R. (1954). Sociology. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

MacIver, R. M. (1937). Society: A textbook of sociology. New York: Farrar and Rinehart.

Mack, Raymond, & Young, Kimball. (1968). Sociology and social life. New York: American Book Co.

Martindale, Dan, & Monachesi, Elio D. (1951). Elements of sociology. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Matthews, Fred. (1977). Quest for an American sociology, Robert E. Park and the Chicago School. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

McCormick, Thomas C. (1950). Sociology: An introduction to the study of social relations. New York: The Ronald Press Co.

McGee, Reec, & Others. (1977). Sociology: An introduction. Hinsdale, IL: The Dryden Press.

Mercer, Blaine E. (1958). The study of society. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.

Merrill, Francis E. (1969). Society and culture. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Merrill, Francis I., & Eldredge, Wentworth H. (1952). Culture and society. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Mizwicki, Ephraim H. (1967). The substance of sociology. New York: Appleton Century Crofts.

Mott, Paul E. (1965). The organization of society. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Murray, Raymond W. (1950). Sociology for a democratic society. New York: Appleton Century Crofts.

O'Brien, Martin. (1951, 1964). Reading in general sociology. New York: Schrag, Houghton, Mifflin.

Odum, Howard W. (1947). Understanding society. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Odum, Howard W. (1951). American sociology, the story of sociology in the United States through 1950. New York: Longmans, Green and Co.

Ogburn, William F., & Nimkiff, Meyer F. (1947). Sociology. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Osborn, Loran, & Neumeger, Martin H. (1933). *The community and society: An introduction to sociology*. New York: American Book Co.

Page, Charles H. (1940). *Class and American sociology from Ward to Ross*. New York: The Dial Press.

Perrucci, Robert, Knudsen, Dean D., & Hamby, Russell R. (1977). *Sociology: Basic structures and processes*. Dubuque IA: William C. Brown Co. Publishers.

Phelps, Harold A. (1936). *Principles and laws of sociology*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Phillip, Bernard S. (1969). *Sociology: Social structures and change*. New York: Macmillan Co.

Popenoe, David. (1971). *Sociology*. New York: Appleton Crofts.

Reuter, E. B., & Hart, C. W. (1933). *Introduction to sociology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc.

Robertson, Ian. (1981). *Sociology*. New York: Worth Publishers, Inc.

Rose, Arnold. (1956). *Sociology: Study of human relations*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Rose, Caroline B. (1965). *Sociology: The study of man in society*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc.

Ross, Edward Alsworth. (1940). *New-age sociology*. New York: D. Appleton Century Co.

Ross, Jerry D. (1974). *Introduction to sociology*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co.

Rumney, Judah. (1938). *The science of society: An introduction to sociology*. London: Duckworth.

Rouceks, Joseph. (1958). *Contemporary sociology*. New York: Philosophical Library.

Schaefer, Richard T. (1986). *Sociology*. New York: McGra-Hill Books.

Schwartz, Howard, & Jacobs, Jerry. (1979). *Qualitative sociology: A method to madness*. New York: The Free Press.

Sims, Newell L. (1924). Society and its surplus. New York: D. Appleton and Co.

Selznick, Phillip, & Broom, Leonard. (1958). Sociology: A text with adapted readings. New York: Row Peterson and Co.

Smelser, Neil J. (Ed.). (1973). Sociology: An introduction. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Smith, Kenneth. (1969). Introduction to sociology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Spencer, Metta, & Inkeles, Alex. (1976). Foundations of modern sociology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Sutherland, Robert L., & Woodward, Julian. (1937, 1940). Introductory sociology. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Company.

Turner, Jonathan. (1978). Sociology: Studying the human system. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing Co., Inc.

Vander Zander, James W. (1975). Sociology. The Ronald Press Company.

Young, Kimball. (1934). Introductory sociology. New York: American Book Co.

Young, Kimball. (1935). Source book for sociology. New York: American Book Company.

Young, Kimball. (1949). Sociology: A study of society and culture. New York: American Book Co.

APPENDIX C
BLACK SOCIOLOGY TEXTBOOKS

Blackwell, James E., & Janowitz, Morris. (1974). *Black sociologists historical and contemporary perspectives*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ladner, Joyce (Ed.). (1973). *The death of white sociology*. New York: Random House.

Staples, Robert. (1976). *Introduction to black sociology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Thompson, Daniel C. (1974). *Sociology of the black experience*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

REFERENCES

Aptheker, H. (1982). Writings by W. E. Du Bois in periodical literature edited by others. Millwood, NY: Kraus Tomson.

Bahr, H. M., Johnson, T. J., & Seitz, M. R. (1971). Influential scholars and works in the sociology of race and minority relations, 1944-1968. The American Sociologist, 6(4), 296-298.

Baltzell, E. D. (1967). Introduction of The Philadelphia Negro by Du Bois [reprint]. New York: Schocken Books.

Beeghley, L. (1978). Social stratification in America: A critical analysis of theory and research. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company.

Blackwell, J. (1974). Role behavior in a corporate structure: Black sociologists in the ASA. In J. Blackwell & M. Janowitz (Eds.), Black sociologists historical and contemporary perspectives (pp. 341-367). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Broderick, F. L. (1958). The search for a career. In R. W. Logan (Ed.), W. E. B. Du Bois: A profile (pp. 1-37). New York: Hill and Wang.

Cox, O. C. (1938). Factors affecting the marital status of Negroes in the United States. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.

Cox, O. C. (1944, Fall). Racial theories of Robert E. Park, et al. Journal of Negro Education, 13, 452-463.

Cox, O. C. (1944, Spring). Class and caste. Journal of Negro Education, 13, 139-149.

Cox, O. C. (1945, Spring). An American dilemma. Journal of Negro Education, 14, 132-148.

Cox, O. C. (1948). Caste, class, and race: A study in social dynamics (ed. 1970). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Cox, O. C. (1959). Foundations of capitalism. New York: Philosophical Library.

Cox, O. C. (1962). Capitalism and American leadership. New York: Philosphical Library.

Cox, O. C. (1964). Capitalism as a system. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Cox, O. C. (1974). Jewish self-interest in black pluralism. Sociological Quarterly, 15, 183-198.

Cox, O. C. (1976). Race relations: Elements and social dynamics. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Cruse, H. (1987). Plural but equal: A critical study of Blacks and minorities in America's plural society. New York: William Morrow and Co., Inc.

Craven, A. (1936). Book review of Black reconstruction by W. E. B. Du Bois. The American Journal of Sociology, 41, 535-536.

Diggs, M. H. (1941). Book review of Growing up in the Black Belt by C. S. Johnson. Social Forces, 20, 287-288.

Drake, S., & Cayton, H. (1945). Black metropolis: A study of Negro life in a northern city. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1897). Strivings of the Negro people. Atlantic Monthly, 80, 194-198.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1899). The Philadelphia Negro: A social study. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). The souls of black folk. Chicago: A. C. McClury & Co.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1904). Credo. Independent, 57, 787.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1908). The Negro American family. Atlanta Study No. 13 (reprinted in the Atlanta University Publications, 1968). New York: Arno Press.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1920). Darkwater: Voices from within the veil. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Howe.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1921). The crisis. New York: NAACP.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1928). Race relations in the United States. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 140, 6-10.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1935). Black reconstruction in America. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1939). Black folk: Then and now; An essay in the history and sociology of the Negro race. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1940). Dusk of dawn: An essay toward an autobiography of race concept. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1943). Reconstruction seventy-five years after. Phylon, 4(3), 205-212.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1968). The autobiography of W. E. B. Du Bois: A soliloquy on viewing my life from the last decade of its first century. New York: International Publishers.

Embree, E. B. (1944). 13 against the odds. Port Washington: Kennikat Press, Inc.

Frazier, E. F. (1918). God and war. New York: E. F. Frazier.

Frazier, E. F. (1924a). A Negro industrial group. Howard Review, 1, 196-211.

Frazier, E. F. (1924b). Some aspects of Negro business. Opportunity, 2, 294-297.

Frazier, E. F. (1925). Durham: Capital of the black middle class. In A. Locke (Ed.), The New Negro. New York: A. and C. Boni Company.

Frazier, E. F. (1926). Three scourges of the Negro family. Opportunity, 4, 210-213, 234.

Frazier, E. F. (1927). Is the Negro family a unique sociological unit? Opportunity, 5, 165-168.

Frazier, E. F. (1927). The pathology of race prejudice. The Forum, 70, 856-862.

Frazier, E. F. (1932). Frazier papers. Shomburg Collection. Unpublished story.

Frazier, E. F. (1932). The Negro family in Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Frazier, E. F. (1939a). Unpublished story. Frazier papers. New York: Shomburg Collection.

Frazier, E. F. (1939b). The Negro family in the United States. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Frazier, E. F. (1949). The Negro in the United States (rev. ed. 1957). New York: The Macmillan Company.

Frazier, E. F. (1957a). Black bourgeoisie: The rise of a new middle class. New York: Free Press-Macmillan.

Frazier, E. F. (1957b). Race and culture contacts in the modern world. New York: A. A. Knopf.

Gittler, J. (1957). Review of sociology analysis of a decade. New York: Wiley.

Goldberg, M. (1941). A qualification of the marginal man theory. Americal Sociological Review, 6(1), 51-58.

Green, D., & Driver, E. (Eds.) (1978). W. E. B. Du Bois on sociology and the black community. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Hughes, E. C. (1948). Review of Caste, class, and race by Oliver C. Cox. Phylon, 9, 66-68.

Hughes, E. C. (1971). Social change and status protest: An essay on a marginal man. In The sociological eye, selected papers. Chicago, IL: Aldine-Atherton.

Johnson, C. (1922). The Negro in Chicago: A study of race relations and a race riot. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, C. (1941). Growing up in the black belt: Negro youth in the rural south. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Johnson, C. (1943). Patterns of Negro segregation. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers.

Johnson, C. (1947). Into the mainstream, a survey of best practices in race relations in the South. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Johnson, C. (1969). Shadow of the plantation. Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, C., Allen, E., Bond, H., McCulloch, M., & Polk, A. (1947). Into the main stream: A survey of best practices in race relations in the south. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Locke, A. (1925). The new Negro: An interpetation. New York: Albert and Charles Boni.

Locke, A. (1943). Book review of Patterns of Negro segregation by C. S. Johnson. American Journal of Sociology, 49:95.

Martin, E. (1971). The sociology of Oliver C. Cox: A systematic inquiry. Master's thesis, Atlanta University, Atlanta.

McCormick, T. (1943). Book review of Patterns of Negro segregation by C. S. Johnson. American Journal of Sociology, 8(4), 491.

Muller, H. (1939). Exercises in incongruity. The Yale Review, 29(1), 97-112.

Myrdal, G. (1962). An American dilemma. New York: Harper and Row.

Park, R. E. (1928a). The bases of race prejudice. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 140, 11-20.

Park, R. E. (1928b). Human migration and the marginal man. The American Journal of Sociology, 33(6), 881-893.

Park, R. E. (1931). Personality and cultural conflict. American Sociological Society, 25(2), 95-110.

Platt, A. M. (1991). E. Franklin Frazier reconsidered. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Reuter, E. B. (1927). The American race problem: A study of the Negro. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co.

Reuter, E. B. (1945). Racial theory. American Journal of Sociology, 50(60), 452-461.

Rudwick, E. M. (1969). W. E. B. Du Bois: Propagandist of the Negro protest. New York: Atheneum.

Saris, R. (1943). To stem this tide: A survey of racial tension areas by C. Johnson [Book review]. American Journal of Sociology, 49(3), 371-372.

Steward, T. (1903). Book review of The souls of Black folk: Essays and sketches by W. E. B. Du Bois. The American Journal of Sociology, 9, 136-137.

Stonequist, E. (1935). The problem of the marginal man. The American Journal of Sociology, 41(1), 1-12.

Stonequist, E. (1961). The marginal man: A study in personality and culture conflict. New York: C. Scribner's Sons.

Thomas, W. I. (1904). The psychology of race-prejudice. American Journal of Sociology, 9(5), 593-611.

Valentine, C. A. (1968). Culture and poverty: Critique and counter-proposals. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Wheatherford, W., & Johnson, C. (1934). Race relations: Adjustment of whites and Negroes in the United States. Boston, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

Winkler, K. (1991, September 11). While concern over race relations has lessened among whites, sociologists say racism is taking new forms, not disappearing. The Chronicle of Higher Education, A8, A10-A11.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Sandra Taylor Thompson is a native of Miami, Florida. She is the wife of Tyree Thompson, Jr., and the mother of Rahmaan and Lillian Thompson. Sandra holds a B.A. degree in history from Voorhes College, Denmark, South Carolina, the Certificate in French from the Université de Poitiér, LaRochelle, France, and the M.A. degree in history from Fisk University, Nashville, Tennessee.

She has taught at Alabama A & M University, Huntsville, Alabama, and has traveled extensively throughout Europe, the Caribbean, and East Africa. She currently serves as an associate professor of history and sociology and as chairman of the Division of Social Sciences at Florida Memorial College, Miami, Florida.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Leonard Beeghley

Leonard Beeghley II, Chairman
Professor of Sociology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Joseph Vandiver

Joseph S. Vandiver
Professor of Sociology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Benjamin L. Gorman
Professor of Sociology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Joe R Feagin

Joe R. Feagin
Professor of Sociology

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Wilse B. Webb
Graduate Research Professor of
Psychology

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the Department of Sociology in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and to the Graduate School and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

December 1991

Dean, Graduate School